



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 2013

No. 89

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 20, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pause now in Your presence and acknowledge our dependence on You.

We ask Your blessing upon the men and women of this, the people's House. Keep them aware of Your presence as they face the tasks of this day, that no burden be too heavy, no duty too difficult, and no work too wearisome.

Help them, and indeed help us all, to obey Your law, to do Your will, and to walk in Your way. Grant that they might be good in thought, gracious in word, generous in deed, and great in spirit.

Make this a glorious day in which all are glad to be alive, eager to work, and ready to serve You, our great Nation, and all our fellow brothers and sisters.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. DUCKWORTH led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CELEBRATING HOOSIER SMALL BUSINESSES

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, in recognition of the 50th Annual National Small Business Week, I rise today to celebrate the Hoosier small businesses that have been serving our communities for decades.

Growing up in South Bend, my parents owned a small appliance repair shop in town, and I learned the value of hard work firsthand. Many of our small businesses were started in Hoosier families and passed on to the next generation.

One such place sits right in Elkhart at Bullard's Farm Market. Owned by Kevin Bullard and his wife, Cindy Reardon, Bullard's was started by his father, a sweet corn grower. It began as eight rows of corn and has grown to cover many acres, including a bakery, greenhouse, and antiques. Bullard's provides fresh, healthy food and local products to Hoosier families. It creates jobs and contributes to our economic engine. Awarded Business of the Year by the Greater Elkhart Chamber of Commerce, Bullard's is a shining example of a Hoosier business.

On Small Business Saturday, I look forward to visiting Bullard's and hope you'll join me in supporting all small businesses to make sure their doors stay open for generations to come.

FEDERAL LEADERS SHOULD LEAD BY EXAMPLE

(Mr. BARROW of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Madam Speaker, very soon thousands of folks in my district in Georgia, and even more across the State, will be furloughed as a result of the budget sequester. Studies have shown that the sequester will cost the Georgia economy approximately \$107 million. Meanwhile, reports circulated this week that President Obama's upcoming trip

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3931

to Africa will cost the taxpayers nearly \$100 million.

Madam Speaker, no one here questions the need for security for our Commander in Chief, but we do question the need for such expensive trips when so many folks across the country are being forced to cut back because Congress can't get its act together. A trip of this magnitude isn't unusual, but these are hard times. \$100 million could be better used to keep folks on the job.

I urge the President and everyone at the Federal level to lead by example and not take the fact that Congress can't get its act together and rub that in the faces of hardworking Americans.

FBI USES DRONES DOMESTICALLY TO PEEP ON AMERICANS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, recently we've learned that the NSA, what I call the "National Surveillance Agency," seized millions of phone records of Americans to try to find a few bad guys. Overreaching and unconstitutional, in my opinion, it violates the right of privacy.

FBI Director Mueller has now confirmed what many of us already believe, that the FBI has used drones domestically to peep on Americans. Who are they spying on? Do they have probable cause? Do they have a warrant from a judge? We don't know.

Madam Speaker, by 2030, there will be 30,000 drones cruising, filming, looking, spying, snooping, and hovering over America's sky. Congress needs to regulate drone use to protect the right of privacy and ensure the Fourth Amendment is actually protected.

Congresswoman LOFGREN and I have filed the Preserving American Privacy Act (PAPA) to make government snoops and private entities follow the Constitution in the use of drones. We must regulate lawful and unlawful drone use because drone laws are needed to keep the peeping tomcrats out of our business.

And that's just the way it is.

NO CHILD IN AMERICA SHOULD GO TO SCHOOL HUNGRY

(Ms. DUCKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam Speaker, the cuts we are considering to SNAP—\$20.5 billion—will be devastating for many American families. There is little room to cut this vital program. The average benefit is only \$4.50 a day, just \$1.50 a meal. These cuts will slash benefits to 2 million Americans and cut more than 200,000 children off the school lunch and school breakfast program.

This is a very personal issue for me. I was one of those children. After my

father lost his job for several years when I was a teenager, food stamps, school breakfast, and school lunch were the only things that saved me. They were there for me so I could worry about school instead of my empty stomach. They nourished me so I could develop the skills to serve my country for the next 20 years—all of the way here to Congress.

I believe that in the wealthiest Nation in the world, no American child should go to school hungry, and no parent should have to make the difficult decision between paying rent or paying for groceries.

Charities, like the Church of the Holy Spirit food pantry in Schaumburg, are already stretched to the limit, trying to meet the needs of our communities during these tough economic times. This means that hungry Americans will have nowhere else to turn.

I ask my colleagues to reject these draconian cuts.

□ 0910

CELEBRATING WEST VIRGINIA'S 150TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. MCKINLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Speaker, today, the great State of West Virginia is celebrating its 150th year birthday.

The unique history of the Mountain State is a source of pride for all West Virginians. On this day in 1863, West Virginia entered the Union to become the 35th State. It is the only State born during that divisive War Between the States, and the only State formed by Presidential decree.

From these challenging years, our State has become a significant contributor to America's economy. West Virginia's natural resources—coal, oil, natural gas, and timber—have played an integral role in the industrialization of our country. Now, in addition to providing energy to continue fueling our Nation's economy, West Virginia has grown into a leader in health care, research, education, biotech, aerospace, and many other diverse industries.

The Mountain State's natural beauty also attracts people from all around the world to visit and enjoy its breathtaking scenery.

Madam Speaker, today West Virginia takes special pride in our wild and wonderful State. We celebrate our past and look forward to the future.

Happy birthday, West Virginia. Here's to the next 150 years.

SNAP ISN'T A HANDOUT; IT'S AN ASSIST

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of many Illinois residents and one in seven American families in opposing the \$20.5

billion cut to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program in this year's FARRM Bill.

I have always believed that an America where we're in this together is much better than an America where we're on our own.

For 46 million low-income Americans, SNAP is a helping hand, and it's our Nation's most important antihunger program. It's also the most effective defense against the steep rise in extreme poverty in America. Between 1996 and 2011, SNAP kept more households with children out of extreme poverty than any other government program.

I have ended my participation in the SNAP challenge, where I lived on \$4.50 worth of food a day. While I merely participated in this as a challenge, I often thought about the many families for whom this is an everyday reality.

SNAP isn't a bailout. SNAP isn't a handout. SNAP is an assist. It's a bridge over troubled water, and there is still more we can do.

RECOGNIZING THE GIRLS EDINA GOLF TEAM FOR THEIR 2013 STATE GOLF TOURNAMENT WIN

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I want to recognize the achievements of the Edina High School girls golf team. This talented group of young ladies recently demonstrated extreme passion and dedication and intensity in a commanding win in this year's Minnesota State High School Golf Tournament.

The Edina girls team should be proud, not only for being named winners of this year's tournament, but also for having the lowest overall score in State tournament history. This now brings the Hornets' championship total to eight, the most ever in Minnesota.

These student athletes are great role models, and they're also setting themselves up to be a positive standard for all of their classmates.

Congratulations to the team, and congratulations to the coaches for their hard work and their dedication and for this year's big win.

Go Hornets.

PROPOSED CUTS TO THE SNAP PROGRAM

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to speak out against the drastic cuts proposed to the SNAP program, a lifeline that millions of Americans rely on.

The FARRM Bill being debated today would cut over \$20 billion over 10 years from SNAP, a program that ensures that children, seniors, and families struggling to make ends meet don't have to go without food.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that these cuts would leave 2 million Americans without essential food assistance and cut 200,000 children from the school lunch program.

Food pantries in all corners of my district tell me that they are already struggling to keep up with the need. The Interfaith Food Pantry in Aurora, Illinois, provides food assistance to 750 families each week. Forty percent of those families also get SNAP benefits, which are, unfortunately, insufficient to meet their food needs.

If these SNAP cuts are implemented, more families will be forced to turn to volunteer-run pantries, which are already stretched dangerously thin, and many people will have nowhere to turn.

Madam Speaker, there is a long list of Federal programs for which the benefits are uncertain or for which the benefits are certain to be delivered to narrow groups for which the need is unclear. SNAP is not one of these, and I urge my colleagues to reconsider these drastic cuts.

2013 ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE YOUTH TOUR

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the more than 1,600 young men and women who have come to our Capitol from across America this week to participate in the 49th annual Electric Cooperative Youth Tour.

These high school juniors and seniors that you see around the Capitol this week are here to get firsthand insights about our Nation's government and its political process and gain a greater understanding of our history. They will meet with their Representatives and Senators and watch Congress in action from the galleries and also visit many memorials and the museums.

I look forward to meeting with the 106 students from the State of Georgia, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

These students coming from the Electric Cooperative Tour are part of a great tradition. In 1957, Texas Senator Lyndon Baines Johnson inspired the youth tour when he addressed the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association meeting in Chicago. The Senator and future President declared:

If one thing comes out of this meeting, it will be sending youngsters to the Nation's capital where they can actually see what the flag stands for and represents.

So every June, for the past 49 years, over 50,000 young citizens and future leaders have put those words into action, and you can see the results of this tradition right here in the Capitol. Several of the groups have spawned congressional aides and elected Representatives themselves.

Back home in Georgia, the chairman of our State House Appropriations

Committee, Terry England, is a prime example of someone who had the desire for public office and ran for elective office when it was fueled as a student when he came up here on the electric co-op tour some 20 years ago.

I congratulate Terry and thousands of others just like him who have engaged in this great tour. And I commend the national Electric Cooperative Youth Tour and thank the Georgia EMCs for all the great work they are doing in developing America's youth.

COMMEMORATING THE LIVES LOST IN THE SHOOTING RAMPAGE AT SANTA MONICA

(Mr. WAXMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the lives lost in the tragic shooting rampage on the streets of Santa Monica and at Santa Monica College. On June 7, Samir Zawahri, Chris Zawahri, Marcela Franco, Carlos Navarro Franco, and Margarita Gomez lost their lives. We take a moment to honor them, and make a promise that we will remember them.

I want to express my condolences to the victims' families. Your losses are Los Angeles' losses, and we grieve with you.

There were many wounded, and we send our best wishes for a full and speedy recovery.

I also rise to commend the heroic actions of our first responders. Without their fearless response, many more lives could have been lost. We thank these first responders who arrived on the scene and bravely protected us all. Our Nation expresses its gratitude.

We are losing too many of our fellow citizens to gun violence. We must stop this cycle. My colleagues in Congress must come together to enact common-sense reforms, including comprehensive background checks. We must address the mental health needs of our community.

We cannot allow the tragedy that occurred in Santa Monica to be repeated. The lives lost in Santa Monica cannot just be another statistic. They must inspire us to make our community and our Nation safer and more secure for everyone.

□ 0920

FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASIDY). Pursuant to House Resolution 271 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1947.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 0924

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 19, 2013, amendment No. 58, printed in part B of House Report 113-117, offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. PITTS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 98 printed in part B of House Report 113-117.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike subtitle C of title I (sugar) and insert the following:

Subtitle C—Sugar

SEC. 1301. SUGAR PROGRAM.

(a) SUGARCANE.—Section 156(a) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) 18 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for each of the 2014 through 2018 crop years.”.

(b) SUGAR BEETS.—Section 156(b)(2) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(b)(2)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2018”.

(c) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Section 156(i) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(i)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2018”.

SEC. 1302. FLEXIBLE MARKETING ALLOTMENTS FOR SUGAR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 359b of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking “2012” and inserting “2018”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “at reasonable prices” after “stocks”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “but” after the semicolon at the end and inserting “and”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) appropriate to maintain adequate domestic supplies at reasonable prices, taking into account all sources of domestic supply, including imports.”.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF FLEXIBLE MARKETING ALLOTMENTS.—Section 359c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359cc) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “but” after the semicolon at the end and inserting “and”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) appropriate to maintain adequate supplies at reasonable prices, taking into account all sources of domestic supply, including imports.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting “at reasonable prices” after “market”; and

(2) in subsection (g)(1)—

(A) by striking “ADJUSTMENTS.—” and all that follows through “Subject to subparagraph (B), the” and inserting “ADJUSTMENTS.—The”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B).

(C) SUSPENSION OR MODIFICATION OF PROVISIONS.—Section 359j of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359jj) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) SUSPENSION OR MODIFICATION OF PROVISIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the Secretary may suspend or modify, in whole or in part, the application of any provision of this part if the Secretary determines that the action is appropriate, taking into account—

“(1) the interests of consumers, workers in the food industry, businesses (including small businesses), and agricultural producers; and

“(2) the relative competitiveness of domestically produced and imported foods containing sugar.”.

(d) ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF RATE QUOTAS.—Section 359k of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359kk) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 359k. ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF RATE QUOTAS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, at the beginning of the quota year, the Secretary shall establish the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar at no less than the minimum level necessary to comply with obligations under international trade agreements that have been approved by Congress.

“(b) ADJUSTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (a), the Secretary shall adjust the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar to provide adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices in the domestic market.

“(2) ENDING STOCKS.—Subject to paragraphs (1) and (3), the Secretary shall establish and adjust tariff-rate quotas in such a manner that the ratio of sugar stocks to total sugar use at the end of the quota year will be approximately 15.5 percent.

“(3) MAINTENANCE OF REASONABLE PRICES AND AVOIDANCE OF FORFEITURES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish a different target for the ratio of ending stocks to total use if, in the judgment of the Secretary, the different target is necessary to prevent—

“(i) unreasonably high prices; or

“(ii) forfeitures of sugar pledged as collateral for a loan under section 156 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272).

“(B) ANNOUNCEMENT.—The Secretary shall publicly announce any establishment of a target under this paragraph.

“(4) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing tariff-rate quotas under subsection (a) and making adjustments under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider the impact of the quotas on consumers, workers, businesses (including small businesses), and agricultural producers.

“(c) TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF QUOTAS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To promote full use of the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations that provide that any country that has been allocated a share of the quotas may temporarily transfer all or part

of the share to any other country that has also been allocated a share of the quotas.

“(2) TRANSFERS VOLUNTARY.—Any transfer under this subsection shall be valid only on voluntary agreement between the transferor and the transferee, consistent with procedures established by the Secretary.

“(3) TRANSFERS TEMPORARY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any transfer under this subsection shall be valid only for the duration of the quota year during which the transfer is made.

“(B) FOLLOWING QUOTA YEAR.—No transfer under this subsection shall affect the share of the quota allocated to the transferor or transferee for the following quota year.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Section 359l(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359ll(a)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2018”.

SEC. 1303. REPEAL OF FEEDSTOCK FLEXIBILITY PROGRAM FOR BIOENERGY PRODUCERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9010 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8110) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 359a(3)(B) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359aa(3)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking clause (iii).

(2) Section 359b(c)(2)(C) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb(c)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “, except for” and all that follows through “ of 2002”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, for those of us in support of my amendment, I will divide 5 minutes under the control of Congressman DANNY DAVIS, 5 minutes on my side.

I rise in support of my amendment, one that would reform our government's sugar program. For too long, we've seen these subsidies and market protections drive up costs on taxpayers, consumers, and businesses. Let me highlight some of the costs now:

Consumers are paying an extra \$3.5 billion a year to subsidize this policy.

Taxpayers are set to foot a bill of \$239 million over the next several years, according to the CBO. The CBO estimated our amendment would save \$73 million.

American workers are paying the price in job losses. Nearly 127,000 jobs were lost by sugar-using industries between 1997 and 2011. At risk are an additional 600,000 manufacturing jobs.

My amendment would help get the price of sugar closer to the world price. It does so by reforming the sugar program, not repealing it. American sugar is still going to have its support program much the same as it did before the 2008 farm bill. We're simply returning to those policies in order to get a more competitive price, one that will help consumers, manufacturers, and even growers.

Under the 2008 farm bill, refined sugar prices have averaged 68 percent more than under the 2002 farm bill. Our detractors are quick to point out that sugar prices are falling, but then they neglected to tell the taxpayer that they are set to bail out the sugar industry, possibly by amounts of \$100 million a year in the coming years. So at the same time this reckless policy sticks the costs of subsidies to consumers, we are set to start spending taxpayer money on supporting sugar farmers, even while the price of U.S. sugar was 64 percent higher than the world price last year.

All we are seeking to do is to return the sugar program to what it was under the 2002 farm bill policy. I'm not sure about you, but I don't remember having any trouble getting sugar into my coffee in 2008. But since the last farm bill, companies have been struggling to find affordable sugar, so much so that Canada has actively been advertising to our manufacturing base that they have access to cheaper sugar. Furthermore, the inflated price of sugar has incentivized Mexico to dump sugar into our market.

So, we're losing jobs to the north, and we're getting hit from foreign sugar from the south due to this reckless policy. So let's reform it. Let's get back into the free market, into the sugar market. Let's get American jobs to stay here. Let's save consumers and taxpayers money. Let's reform our sugar policy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I'd like to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, we hear a lot from the proponents of this amendment about moving American companies to Mexico and to Canada. But that has nothing to do with the price of sugar. It has everything to do with labor costs, health care costs, and trying to get every penny out of the American farmer.

□ 0930

Have any of you seen the price of sugar, cakes or cookies plummet over the last few years as sugar prices have decreased by 55 percent? No, you haven't.

You will hear a lot from the proponents of this amendment about the high prices of sugar—so high indeed that restaurants give it away and that you can buy a five-pound bag of sugar for almost nothing. The idea that adopting this amendment is going to somehow create a free market for sugar is ludicrous.

The world sugar market is one of the most distorted markets in the world. Adopting this amendment or even repealing sugar policy would do nothing but subject the U.S. to that distorted

market even more than we are today, cost a lot of farmers their livelihoods, and cost this country an industry with all the jobs and economic activity that go with it. Let's be quite clear, the U.S. is already one of the largest sugar importers in the world.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. LUCAS. The second argument is that we are all of a sudden going to have cheaper sugar if we adopt this amendment.

What bothers me the most about this argument is that it was made when sugar prices were 55 percent higher, and it is made just the same when prices are in the tank. How cheap is cheap enough for those who are backing this amendment?

They claim that consumers are being bilked by the high price of sugar, but have any of our colleagues noticed a drop in the price of candy bars as manufacturers faithfully pass along to consumers the savings from a 55 percent drop in sugar prices? Of course not.

Sugar policy has operated at zero cost to the taxpayers for 10 years now. Our farmers are efficient and competitive. Consumers in this country enjoy cheaper sugar than anywhere else in the world, and sugar users enjoy a reliable source of safe sugar.

Candy makers are reporting strong profits as sugar farmers and processors struggle. Neither today's climate nor the climate of 55 percent higher prices was caused by sugar policy. It was caused by conditions in a distorted market. All sugar policy does is provide a low-level safety net so farmers can repay their loan principal plus interest and farm another day.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS.)

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois will control 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, let's be clear: unequivocally, and without a doubt, we know that the sugar subsidy raises the price of sugar on the domestic market in this country.

I know that I have lost out of my congressional district major candy makers and food processors who left town—not because of labor costs, not because of any rifts, but because they were paying so much for the price of sugar that they knew that if they went to Mexico, if they went to Canada that they could get sugar at a much lower price.

I don't know why we help 4,000 sugar growers at the expense of 600,000 workers in America. I say vote "yes" for the Pitts-Davis-Blumenauer-Goodlatte amendment. When you do that, you are helping the guy who gets a cup of coffee and needs to use sugar for the sweetener.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This is nothing but an attack on the thousands of family farms in my district and across the country.

The district I represent is home to Michigan Sugar, a co-op owned by 900 American family farmers. The idea of Big Sugar is flat-out false. To compare a co-op, a growers' co-op such as Michigan Sugar, to a large, multinational corporation is fallacy and wrong.

Back in my district, when I visit these hardworking third- and fourth-generation farmers, all they ask for is a fair and even playing field. These farmers work hard, they play by the rules, and they shouldn't be punished, as this amendment would do. That's why I stand with the American family farms and not foreign government-subsidized sugar.

Big corporate food processors are not moving overseas because of sugar costs; they are moving overseas to avoid providing health care and living wages to their workers. Furthermore, if Big Business is able to target one crop at a time, the entire farm bill loses its worth.

If you support family farms, you will oppose this amendment.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, at this time I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished vice chair of the Ag Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, this FARRM Bill reforms many commodity programs. It makes major policy changes that leave no commodity untouched except for one. This bill makes absolutely no change to the sugar program. In fact, the sugar program wasn't even given the scrutiny of an audit hearing.

Under this bill, we are being asked to demand sacrifices from farmers in our districts. Wheat, corn, soybeans, cotton, peanuts, and rice—these commodities and more are undergoing major changes and contributing to the deficit reduction in this bill. But we're asked to believe that the sugar program and the sugar program alone is so perfect that it must be left untouched, it cannot be reformed or even discussed. I respectfully disagree.

The sugar program needs to be reformed for many reasons:

First, all serious studies show that the sugar program increases food costs. Economists at Iowa State University put this consumer cost at up to \$3.5 billion a year for the first 4 years of the 2008 farm bill.

Second, because it harms the competitiveness of U.S. food manufacturing, the sugar program costs jobs. The Iowa State study estimated that as many as 20,000 new jobs a year could be created if sugar policy were fully reformed. The U.S. Department of Commerce found that for every sugar indus-

try job saved by the program, three good manufacturing jobs were lost.

Third, current sugar policy may not have cost taxpayers at the moment, but the Congressional Budget Office projects that it will in the future. The Feedstock Flexibility Program—which was added to the sugar policy in 2008—is forecast to cost \$193 million.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Fourth, the sugar program constitutes an almost unbelievable government intrusion into private business decisions. Under the marketing allotment system, the federal government tells every sugar company the exact amount of sugar that it is legal for the company to sell, down to the pound. USDA issues press releases every year with each private company's exact sales quota listed. Can you imagine what my colleagues would call that if we did it in any other industry in America? It is a pure command-and-control regime.

For all these reasons, I believe we need a serious discussion about sugar policy. A case could be made to repeal it completely. But that is not what I am proposing.

This amendment does not repeal the sugar program or sugar import quotas.

Instead, the amendment removes several features that were added to sugar policy in 2008, and makes some additional program reforms. Specifically, it eliminates—new restrictions that prevent Secretary Vilsack from increasing import quotas between October 1 and April 1, and require that he set the import quota at the bare minimum allowed under our international obligations, regardless of market needs; the Feedstock Flexibility Program, which requires the government to buy up surplus sugar and re-sell it to ethanol plants at a loss to taxpayers; a de facto domestic content requirement, which prevents USDA from reducing marketing allotments below 85% of the market, even if that would save the government money; and price support increases that were mandated in 2008. This part of the amendment is scored by CBO as contributing to a net savings of \$73 million.

The amendment also makes the sugar program more flexible and transparent: first, by permitting developing countries to lease one another's sugar quotas temporarily, thus allowing small quota-holding countries that no longer produce sugar to derive some benefit from their quotas, and ensuring that all quota sugar will actually be imported; second, by setting a goal that ending stocks of sugar will be approximately 15.5% of total demand, thereby making policies more transparent; and third, by restoring Secretary Vilsack's authority to suspend marketing allotments in emergency conditions, authority taken away in 2008.

In 2008, Congress went too far in shackling sugar policy with new market-shorting provisions. We have seen the results in the four years after enactment of the farm bill.

With USDA unable to increase imports even when supplies were tight, both wholesale and retail sugar prices in the United States have set all-time records.

At the same time, the gap between U.S. and world sugar prices widened far beyond historic levels.

Supplies were so tight in the summer of 2010 that the United States imported 200,000 tons of "high-tier" or "over-quota" sugar. This means the importer willingly paid a tariff that

is deliberately set so high as to be prohibitive in normal conditions. There was simply no other sugar available from U.S., Mexican or quota sources.

Once again, our amendment does not change the basic tenets of sugar policy. A good case can be made to do that, but I fully understand that many of my colleagues would not support a repeal. Instead, this amendment rolls back counterproductive policies that have distorted markets and increased consumer costs since they were enacted in 2008.

The amendment's scope is modest, but it is genuine reform. I once again ask my colleagues: Do you really believe that we should cut programs for farmers in your district, but leave sugar policy absolutely untouched? If you do not believe that, please vote for the sugar reform amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chairman, I am pleased now to yield 1 minute to the chairman of the subcommittee that deals with this, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Sugar users and folks who buy it by the ton are not going broke. If you look at Hershey, which is one of the main proponents for changing this policy, in 2007 they made \$217 million—I don't begrudge them that; I wish I were a shareholder. In 2012, they made \$660 million—a threefold increase in their prices. Their own annual report says that sugar costs went from 54 cents a pound to 37 cents a pound, and that that would not be reflected in their prices because of the way they manage the rest of their business. If the sugar buyers were actually going broke, then that would be reflected in one of the largest sugar users, which is Hershey.

This is about protecting American producers, men and women who get up every morning to fight the fight for American agriculture and grow sugar, process sugar, so that you and I can pick it up off a table free and walk out of a restaurant with it.

The current policy works. Often, if it's not broke, don't fix it. This also fits in the category that if a fellow is down, you don't kick him. The sugar industry is down right now because of a 52 percent decrease in the price of sugar. Let's don't kick them while they're down.

This current policy works. Let's don't fix it, because it's not broken. And the \$38 million pro-rated over 10 years is a bargain.

Oppose this amendment.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairwoman, I don't have any sugar manufacturing jobs in my district, let alone any sugar beet farms or sugar cane fields, but all of my constituents and all of the constituents of every Member of this body pay a share of the \$3.5 billion annual hidden food tax on consumers. So it seems to me that's what this is about.

And to go from the personal to the national, according to the U.S. Depart-

ment of Commerce, for each sugar production job saved, this sugar program has eliminated three jobs in food manufacturing. Three jobs lost for every job saved. So if we're really about creating jobs and not losing them, we ought to reform this sugar program.

□ 0940

Current policy keeps sugar prices higher than the world market price and that encourages food manufacturing jobs to move offshore. As a result, between 1997 and 2011, 127,000 jobs were lost in segments of the food and beverage industries that use sugar to make their products.

I also object, Madam Chairman, to the idea of paying \$239 million in taxpayer purchases for a sugar-to-ethanol mandate. It ought to be eliminated, which this amendment would do.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to a good friend of the American farmer and agriculture, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pitts amendment.

The proponents of the amendment claim that sugar prices are too high, but U.S. raw sugar prices have dropped by more than half just since the fall of 2011.

In 2004, more than 200 people lost their jobs when the Domino sugar plant in Brooklyn, New York, closed its doors. That plant predated the Brooklyn Bridge, it outlasted the Brooklyn Dodgers, and now it is gone. So are the paychecks that its employees used to collect.

I have a sugar refinery in my district in Yonkers, New York, and I don't want the same thing to happen to them. The sugar industry supports 142,000 jobs in 22 States, including 300 at this plant in my district.

Our current policy supports this industry at no cost to the taxpayers. In fact, the USDA has predicted a zero cost increase over the next 10 years.

I come from the school that "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Until we have a level playing field on the world market, we must continue our current sugar policy.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 30 seconds remaining. And the gentleman from Illinois has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, we have all heard the phrase "American as apple pie," but it is shameful to think that every American pie has baked into it Soviet-style sugar. We have a Byzantine array of government production quotas, import quotas, mandatory target prices. And what does it do? It destroys three jobs for every one it creates and transfers

millions of dollars from working Americans to 6,000 sugar growers.

It is time for us to put "American" back into "American as apple pie." Let's support the gentleman from Pennsylvania's amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Food and candy opponents of U.S. sugar policy would like to expose American sugar farmers to distorted world market for sugar. But the United States sugar growers are already exposed. Mexico has unlimited access to the United States market.

One thing that hasn't been said: 20 percent of the Mexican sugar industry is owned by the Mexican Government. Mexico owns and operates its sugar industry, which is five times larger than the Texas sugar-producing industry. As this chart shows, since 2008, Mexico has gotten unlimited access to the United States sugar market, and, in fact, the prices of sugar are the same prices as they were in the 1980s.

My friends on both sides that propose this amendment say that we need a more free market. The United States cannot unilaterally disarm. That jeopardizes 142,000 jobs and leaves us dependent on the Brazilian and Mexican food industry that is run by the Mexican Government.

This amendment does not promote free trade or free market; it promotes a government-run industry from Mexico and Brazil.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I keep hearing "if it is not broken, don't fix it." Well, I can tell you for the 600,000 people whose jobs are at risk when their companies move out of the country, that seems like broken to me.

I would now like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, there have been assertions that somehow the American sugar industry is down. Because of the changes that were made in the last farm bill, prices soared up to 92 percent. And so there was a temporary increase in American sugar, which created some downward pressure, which in fact is going to require the American taxpayer to bail out in the next several years because of the sugar program's feedstock flexibility.

We are talking about returning to the 2002 law. Every independent economist agrees that the American consumer is paying from \$2 billion to \$3.5 billion excess.

The reason jobs are going to Canada is not because their jobs pay less, it is because the sugar price is less. There are far more jobs in the industries that use sugar than those who produce it.

We are merely asking to return to the 2002 provisions, which were generous enough. Someday—someday—we will deregulate. Someday we will truly

reform. But in the short term this is a reasonable accommodation.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 1½ minutes, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

We advocates for American farmers know that we need free world markets. The proponents of this amendment ignore that other countries, such as Brazil, subsidize their sugar industry as much as \$3 billion per year.

This amendment unilaterally disarms our economy. By doing so it threatens 142,000 farming jobs and potentially places the U.S. consumer at the mercy of market manipulation by foreign governments. At stake is our food security, 142,000 jobs, and the American consumer.

By eliminating this program, which operates at zero cost to the American taxpayer, we hamstringing the ability of our farmers to provide food security for our people.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, there is nothing in the amendment that will bring an additional ounce of sugar under our shores without explicit approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Madam Chairman, I must take exception to some of the remarks I've heard here today. This amendment is absolutely necessary for this country, for the consumer. We are talking about saving consumers \$3.5 billion a year and saving 20,000 manufacturing jobs.

I must strenuously object to those who say the price of sugar is so low. Let me tell you what is going to happen. When the price of sugar drops below a certain level, the Federal Government will buy that excess sugar, then sell it to ethanol producers at a loss. The taxpayer and the consumer is royally abused twice.

This is protectionism at its worse. We all know it. It is time to reform this program.

This is not a zero-zero policy as the proponents claim. This is going to cost taxpayers \$239 million over the next several years. That is according to CBO. \$80 million of taxpayer-funded bailout could come later this year.

This issue is about protecting manufacturing jobs, making sure that we have something closer to a market-based price.

I represent Hershey, Pennsylvania. I just heard a statement saying, no sugar packets handed out to res-

taurants are free. Well, that cost is built into the meal that you eat. It is absurd. It is absolutely absurd. We are losing jobs to countries that have more market-based sugar policies.

I urge strong support for the Pitts-Goodlatte-Davis-Blumenauer amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

□ 0950

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chair, I represent a State that was literally built on sugar, and we are now down to one sugar-producing company in the whole State. We do not have the sugarcane blowing in the wind as we had in the past. What this amendment is going to do is really, when you think about it, do away with a program that doesn't cost the taxpayers anything. It is an agreement between the USDA and the sugar producers to ensure that the agriculture industry remains stable.

Think about it.

Why do you want to do away with something that doesn't cost us anything at this point in time, that produces jobs and is essential and, instead, give away to world markets that are subsidized? What will happen when those subsidies are deemed to be no longer necessary because of the fact that there is nothing in the United States anymore?

Think about it.

We need to keep agriculture strong. That is what this is all about. It doesn't cost taxpayers anything. This is a program that clearly works and that keeps this industry alive and well, so it makes no sense.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. I represent the Third District of Tennessee. We've heard a great debate today. Let's be clear. The numbers are self-evident.

When the world price of sugar compared to the United States' price of sugar is so out of kilter since reform—72, 91, 77, and 63 percent since 2008—we cannot compete in America based on the world price. It's a commodity. It's an agreement. I urge strong support of this amendment. We've got American jobs at stake. We cannot compete if this program continues. Jobs will leave America. Let's support this amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERSON. I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to my good friend from across the border in North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The idea that somehow this amendment creates free and fair trade is a fallacy, and the idea that somehow sugar has not been reformed in recent years and decades is also a fallacy.

The greatest reformation of the sugar program is the North American Free Trade Agreement, which gave access to U.S. markets completely, not only to the sugar farmers south of us, but to the Governments of Mexico and Brazil. The idea that a no-net-cost program like the American sugar program is somehow a great advantage over countries like Brazil, which is subsidized with tax dollars of \$2.5 to \$3 billion per year, I think is the most distorting fact in this entire debate.

I rise to oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, in closing, I want to thank my colleagues for their statements. I represent the biggest sugar-producing area in the country, and I agree with what has been said by my colleagues.

People need to understand that every country that produces sugar in the world has some intervention in the sugar market. For us to unilaterally disarm, all we are going to do is give away our jobs and our industry to other countries. We import sugar from 41 countries, sugar that we could make in the United States. Fifteen percent of our market we have given to other people. We have opened up the market to Mexico, and yet we haven't had a no-net-cost program until this year when sugar prices collapsed, which is not our fault. It's what's going on in Brazil and other places. So, for people to be complaining that sugar prices are too high when, right now, they're about as low as they've ever been is kind of crazy.

I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment and to continue a policy that works—that's good for America, that's good for the farmers, that's good for the workers, and that's good for the economy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, I rise today against this job killing amendment. Madam Chair, for years people have rallied against our domestic sugar program because they felt it artificially increased prices here at home. Nothing could be further from the truth. Prices have dropped dramatically over the past year, with the culprit being an influx of sugar from foreign countries.

Worldwide agriculture is a distorted market due to foreign price and supply control programs, but sugar takes the cake as being the most distorted commodity in the world. Each year countries like Brazil and Mexico dump millions of tons onto export markets dropping the price of sugar below the cost of producing sugar. This is price manipulation at its worst. That is why I have joined with many of my colleagues in calling for a "Zero-For-Zero" policy that would reduce subsidies world wide. But until our trading partners agree with this policy, we should not place our farmers in direct competition with massive government controlled production by changing our already modest domestic program.

I urge my colleagues to vote for thousands of American jobs by defeating this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113-117 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 18 by Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

Amendment No. 25 by Mr. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 26 by Mr. MARINO of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 30 by Mr. SCHWEIKERT of Arizona.

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. TIERNEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 37 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 38 by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. MARINO of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 43 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment No. 44 by Mr. GIBSON of New York.

Amendment No. 45 by Mrs. WALORSKI of Indiana.

Amendment No. 46 by Mr. COURTNEY of Connecticut.

Amendment No. 47 by Mr. KIND of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 48 by Mr. CARNEY of Delaware.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 103, noes 322, not voting 9, as follows:

Amash
Bachmann
Barr
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Culberson
Daines
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fleischmann
Flores
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Cramer

[Roll No. 264]

AYES—103

Graves (GA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hensarling
Holding
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Jones
Jordan
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Long
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Messer
Miller (FL)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Nugent
Palazzo
Paulsen
Perry
Petri

NOES—322

Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva

Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter

Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOT VOTING—9

Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Slaughter
Young (AK)

□ 1022

Messrs. GUTIÉRREZ, KELLY of Pennsylvania, and MEEKS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Messrs. COOPER, MULVANEY, ROKITA, NUGENT, and Mrs. BACHMANN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 297, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

AYES—123

Andrews Green, Al
Bass Green, Gene
Beatty Gutiérrez
Becerra Hahn
Bishop (GA) Higgins
Bishop (NY) Holt
Blumenauer Horsford
Bonamici Hoyer
Brady (PA) Huffman
Braley (IA) Israel
Brown (FL) Jackson Lee
Brownley (CA) Jeffries
Butterfield Johnson (GA)
Carson (IN) Johnson, E. B.
Cartwright Jones
Castor (FL) Kaptur
Chu Kelly (IL)
Clarke Kirkpatrick
Clay Kuster
Clyburn Labrador
Courtney Langevin
Crowley Larson (CT)
Cummins Lee (CA)
Davis (CA) Lewis
Davis, Danny Lofgren
DeFazio Lowenthal
DeLauro Lowey
Deutch Luján, Ben Ray
Doggett (NM)
Doyle Marchant
Edwards McDermott
Ellison McNERNEY
Engel Meeks
Enyart Meng
Eshoo Miller, George
Esty Moore
Fattah Moran
Fitzpatrick Nadler
Frankel (FL) Napolitano
Fudge Negrete McLeod
Garamendi Noem
Grayson O'Rourke

NOES—297

Aderholt Cook
Alexander Cooper
Amash Costa
Amodei Cotton
Bachmann Cramer
Bachus Crawford
Barber Crenshaw
Barletta Cuellar
Barr Culberson
Barrow (GA) Daines
Barton Davis, Rodney
Benishek DeGette
Bentivolio Delaney
Bera (CA) DelBene
Bilirakis Denham
Bishop (UT) Dent
Black DeSantis
Blackburn DesJarlais
Bonner Diaz-Balart
Boustany Dingell
Brady (TX) Duckworth
Bridenstine Duffy
Brooks (AL) Duncan (SC)
Brooks (IN) Duncan (TN)
Broun (GA) Ellmers
Buchanan Farenthold
Bucshon Farr
Burgess Fincher
Bustos Fleischmann
Calvert Fleming
Camp Flores
Campbell Forbes
Cantor Fortenberry
Capito Foster
Capps Foxx
Capuano Franks (AZ)
Cárdenas Frelinghuysen
Carney Gabbard
Carter Gallego
Cassidy Garcia
Castro (TX) Gardner
Chabot Garrett
Chaffetz Gerlach
Cicilline Gibbs
Coble Gibson
Coffman Gingrey (GA)
Cohen Gohmert
Collins (GA) Goodlatte
Collins (NY) Gosar
Conaway Gowdy
Connolly Granger
Conyers Graves (GA)

Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)

Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascarell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

Cleaver
Cole
Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa

Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schradner
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema

NOT VOTING—14

Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary

Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Slaughter
Young (AK)

□ 1026

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. NOEM. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 265, I inadvertently voted “yea” when I intended to oppose the amendment.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 265, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. MARINO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 79, noes 346, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

AYES—79

Graves (MO)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Hunter
Kinzinger (IL)
Ross
Labrador
Lamborn
Lankford
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Murphy (FL)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Olson
Peters (CA)

NOES—346

Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn

Maloney, Sean
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKinley
 McNeerney
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Pittenger
 Pocan
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey

Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Radel
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Richmond
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Rothfus
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Runyan
 Ruppertsberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Speier
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walden
 Walorski
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Wenstrup
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Yoho

NOT VOTING—9

Hastings (FL)
 Herrera Beutler
 Honda

Larsen (WA)
 Markey
 McCarthy (NY)

Miller, Gary
 Slaughter
 Young (AK)

□ 1031

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Chair, during rollcall vote No. 266 on H.R. 1947, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “no” when I should have voted “yes.” I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the record following rollcall vote No. 266.

Stated against:

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 266 I inadvertently voted “yea” and I intended to vote “nay.”

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 232, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

AYES—194

Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buchson
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cotton
 Crawford
 Culberson
 Daines
 Denham
 DeSantis
 DeJarlais
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy

Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Hensarling
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kline
 Kschweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Rodgers
 Meadows
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Palazzo

Paulsen
 Perry
 Petri
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Radel
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoho
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOES—232

Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coffman
 Cohen
 Cole
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio

DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Dent
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fitzpatrick
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego

Garamendi
 Garcia
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hanna
 Harper
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holt
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 Loebach
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)

Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McNeerney
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Lofgren
 Richmond
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Runyan
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush

Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 McKeon
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Sinema
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stivers
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Wolf
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Hastings (FL)
 Herrera Beutler
 Honda

Larsen (WA)
 Markey
 McCarthy (NY)

Miller, Gary
 Slaughter

□ 1036

Mr. JOYCE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. TIERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 211, noes 215, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

AYES—211

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Alexander | Green, Al | Owens |
| Andrews | Green, Gene | Palazzo |
| Bass | Grijalva | Pallone |
| Beatty | Grimm | Pascarell |
| Becerra | Gutiérrez | Pastor (AZ) |
| Bera (CA) | Hahn | Payne |
| Bishop (GA) | Hanabusa | Pelosi |
| Bishop (NY) | Hanna | Perlmutter |
| Blumenauer | Harris | Peters (CA) |
| Bonamici | Heck (WA) | Peters (MI) |
| Boustany | Higgins | Peterson |
| Brady (PA) | Himes | Pingree (ME) |
| Braley (IA) | Holt | Pocan |
| Brown (FL) | Horsford | Posey |
| Brownley (CA) | Hoyer | Price (NC) |
| Bustos | Huffman | Quigley |
| Butterfield | Israel | Rahall |
| Capps | Jackson Lee | Rangel |
| Capuano | Jeffries | Richmond |
| Cárdenas | Johnson (GA) | Rooney |
| Carney | Johnson, E. B. | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Carson (IN) | Jones | Roybal-Allard |
| Cartwright | Joyce | Runyan |
| Cassidy | Kaptur | Ruppersberger |
| Castor (FL) | Keating | Rush |
| Castro (TX) | Kelly (IL) | Ryan (OH) |
| Chu | Kennedy | Sánchez, Linda T. |
| Ciçilline | Kildee | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Clarke | Kilmer | Sarbanes |
| Clay | Kind | Schakowsky |
| Cleaver | King (NY) | Schiff |
| Clyburn | Kirkpatrick | Schneider |
| Coble | Kuster | Schrader |
| Cohen | Langevin | Schwartz |
| Connolly | Larson (CT) | Scott (VA) |
| Conyers | Lee (CA) | Scott, David |
| Cooper | Levin | Serrano |
| Costa | Lewis | Sewell (AL) |
| Courtney | Lipinski | Shea-Porter |
| Crenshaw | LoBiondo | Sherman |
| Crowley | Loeb sack | Sinema |
| Cuellar | Lofgren | Sires |
| Cummings | Lowenthal | Smith (NJ) |
| Davis (CA) | Lowe y | Smith (WA) |
| Davis, Danny | Luján, Ben Ray | Southerland |
| DeFazio | (NM) | Speier |
| DeGette | Lynch | Swalwell (CA) |
| Delaney | Maffei | Takano |
| DeLauro | Maloney, | Thompson (CA) |
| DelBene | Carolyn | Thompson (MS) |
| Deutch | Maloney, Sean | Tierney |
| Dingell | Matheson | Titus |
| Doggett | Matsui | Tonko |
| Doyle | McCollum | Tsongas |
| Duckworth | McDermott | Van Hollen |
| Edwards | McGovern | Vargas |
| Ellison | McIntyre | Veasey |
| Engel | McNerney | Vela |
| Enyart | Meeks | Velázquez |
| Eshoo | Meng | Visclosky |
| Esty | Mica | Walz |
| Farr | Michaud | Wasserman |
| Fattah | Miller, George | Schultz |
| Fitzpatrick | Moore | Waters |
| Foster | Moran | Watt |
| Frankel (FL) | Murphy (FL) | Waxman |
| Fudge | Nadler | Welch |
| Gabbard | Napolitano | Wilson (FL) |
| Gallego | Neal | Yarmuth |
| Garamendi | Negrete McLeod | Young (AK) |
| Garcia | Nolan | |
| Gibson | O'Rourke | |

NOES—215

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| Aderholt | Buchanan | Davis, Rodney |
| Amash | Bucshon | Denham |
| Amodei | Burgess | Dent |
| Bachmann | Calvert | DeSantis |
| Bachus | Camp | DesJarlais |
| Barber | Campbell | Diaz-Balart |
| Barletta | Cantor | Duffy |
| Barr | Capito | Duncan (SC) |
| Barrow (GA) | Carter | Duncan (TN) |
| Barton | Chabot | Ellmers |
| Benishkek | Chaffetz | Farenthold |
| Bentivolio | Coffman | Fincher |
| Bilirakis | Cole | Fleischmann |
| Bishop (UT) | Collins (GA) | Fleming |
| Black | Collins (NY) | Flores |
| Blackburn | Conaway | Forbes |
| Bonner | Cook | Fortenberry |
| Brady (TX) | Cotton | Fox x |
| Bridenstine | Cramer | Franks (AZ) |
| Brooks (AL) | Crawford | Frelinghuysen |
| Brooks (IN) | Culberson | Gardner |
| Broun (GA) | Daines | Garrett |

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Gerlach | Marchant | Rothfus |
| Gibbs | Marino | Royce |
| Gingrey (GA) | Massie | Ruiz |
| Gohmert | McCarthy (CA) | Ryan (WI) |
| Goodlatte | McCaul | Salmon |
| Gosar | McClintock | Sanford |
| Gowdy | McHenry | Scalise |
| Granger | McKeon | Schock |
| Graves (GA) | McKinley | Schweikert |
| Graves (MO) | McMorris | Scott, Austin |
| Grayson | Rodgers | Sensenbrenner |
| Griffin (AR) | Meadows | Sessions |
| Griffith (VA) | Meehan | Shimkus |
| Guthrie | Messer | Shuster |
| Hall | Miller (FL) | Simpson |
| Harper | Miller (MI) | Smith (MO) |
| Hartzler | Mullin | Smith (NE) |
| Hastings (WA) | Mulvaney | Smith (TX) |
| Heck (NV) | Murphy (PA) | Stewart |
| Hensarling | Neugebauer | Stivers |
| Hinojosa | Noem | Stockman |
| Holding | Nugent | Stutzman |
| Hudson | Nunes | Terry |
| Huelskamp | Nunnelee | Thompson (PA) |
| Huizenga (MI) | Olson | Thornberry |
| Hultgren | Paulsen | Tiberi |
| Hunter | Pearce | Tipton |
| Hurt | Perry | Turner |
| Issa | Petri | Upton |
| Jenkins | Pittenger | Valadao |
| Johnson (OH) | Pitts | Wagner |
| Johnson, Sam | Poe (TX) | Walberg |
| Jordan | Polis | Walorski |
| Kelly (PA) | Pompeo | Weber (TX) |
| King (IA) | Price (GA) | Webster (FL) |
| Kingston | Radel | Westmoreland |
| Kinzinger (IL) | Reed | Whitfield |
| Kline | Reichert | Williams |
| Labrador | Renacci | Wilson (SC) |
| LaMalfa | Ribble | Wittman |
| Lamborn | Rice (SC) | Wolf |
| Lance | Rigell | Womack |
| Lankford | Roby | Woodall |
| Latham | Roe (TN) | Yoder |
| Latta | Rogers (AL) | Yoho |
| Long | Rogers (KY) | Young (FL) |
| Lucas | Rogers (MI) | Young (IN) |
| Luetkemeyer | Rohrabacher | |
| Lujan Grisham | Rokita | |
| (NM) | Roskam | |
| Lummis | Ross | |

NOT VOTING—8

| | | |
|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Hastings (FL) | Larsen (WA) | Miller, Gary |
| Herrera Beutler | Markey | Slaughter |
| Honda | McCarthy (NY) | |

□ 1041

Mr. GUTHRIE changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. SHERMAN and PALAZZO changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 200, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

AYES—225

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Amash | Gowdy | Paulsen |
| Andrews | Graves (GA) | Payne |
| Bachus | Grayson | Pelosi |
| Barr | Green, Al | Perlmutter |
| Bass | Griffith (VA) | Peters (CA) |
| Becerra | Grijalva | Peters (MI) |
| Benishkek | Guthrie | Peterson |
| Bentivolio | Gutiérrez | Petri |
| Bera (CA) | Hahn | Pingree (ME) |
| Bishop (GA) | Hanabusa | Pocan |
| Bishop (NY) | Hanna | Poe (TX) |
| Blumenauer | Harris | Polis |
| Bonamici | Hastings (WA) | Price (NC) |
| Brady (PA) | Heck (WA) | Quigley |
| Braley (IA) | Higgins | Radel |
| Broun (GA) | Himes | Reed |
| Brown (FL) | Holt | Ribble |
| Brownley (CA) | Horsford | Rice (SC) |
| Butterfield | Hoyer | Rohrabacher |
| Campbell | Huelskamp | Rokita |
| Capps | Huffman | Roybal-Allard |
| Capuano | Hunter | Ruppersberger |
| Cárdenas | Hurt | Rush |
| Carney | Israel | Ryan (OH) |
| Carson (IN) | Jackson Lee | Salmon |
| Cartwright | Jeffries | Sánchez, Linda T. |
| Castor (FL) | Johnson (GA) | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Castro (TX) | Johnson, E. B. | Sanford |
| Chaffetz | Jones | Sarbanes |
| Chu | Kelly (IL) | Schakowsky |
| Ciçilline | Kennedy | Schiff |
| Clarke | Kildee | Schneider |
| Clay | Kilmer | Schrader |
| Cleaver | Kind | Schwartz |
| Coffman | Kline | Schweikert |
| Cohen | Kuster | Scott (VA) |
| Connolly | Labrador | Serrano |
| Conyers | Langevin | Sewell (AL) |
| Cooper | Larson (CT) | Shea-Porter |
| Costa | Lee (CA) | Sherman |
| Courtney | Lipinski | Sires |
| Cramer | Loeb sack | Smith (WA) |
| Crowley | Lofgren | Speier |
| Cuellar | Lowenthal | Stewart |
| Culberson | Lowe y | Stivers |
| Cummings | Lujan Grisham | Stockman |
| Daines | (NM) | Stutzman |
| Davis (CA) | Luján, Ben Ray | Swalwell (CA) |
| Davis, Danny | (NM) | Takano |
| Davis, Rodney | Lummis | Thompson (CA) |
| DeFazio | Lynch | Tierney |
| DeGette | Maffei | Tipton |
| Delaney | Maloney, | Titus |
| DeLauro | Carolyn | Tonko |
| DelBene | Maloney, Sean | Tsongas |
| DeSantis | Massie | Valadao |
| Deutch | Matsui | Van Hollen |
| Dingell | McClintock | Vargas |
| Doggett | McCollum | Vela |
| Doyle | McDermott | Velázquez |
| Duffy | McGovern | Visclosky |
| Edwards | McNerney | Walden |
| Ellison | Meehan | Walz |
| Ellmers | Meng | Watt |
| Engel | Michaud | Waxman |
| Enyart | Miller, George | Welch |
| Eshoo | Moore | Wenstrup |
| Esty | Moran | Westmoreland |
| Farr | Mulvaney | Wilson (FL) |
| Fattah | Nadler | Woodall |
| Fortenberry | Napolitano | Yarmuth |
| Frankel (FL) | Neal | Young (AK) |
| Gabbard | Negrete McLeod | Young (IN) |
| Garamendi | Nolan | |
| Gardner | O'Rourke | |
| Garrett | Pallone | |
| Gibson | Pastor (AZ) | |

NOES—200

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| Aderholt | Brooks (AL) | Collins (NY) |
| Alexander | Brooks (IN) | Conaway |
| Amodei | Buchanan | Cook |
| Bachmann | Bucshon | Cotton |
| Barber | Burgess | Crawford |
| Barletta | Bustos | Crenshaw |
| Barrow (GA) | Calvert | Denham |
| Barton | Camp | Dent |
| Beatty | Cantor | DesJarlais |
| Bilirakis | Capito | Diaz-Balart |
| Bishop (UT) | Carter | Duckworth |
| Black | Cassidy | Duncan (SC) |
| Blackburn | Chabot | Duncan (TN) |
| Bonner | Clyburn | Farenthold |
| Boustany | Coble | Fincher |
| Brady (TX) | Cole | Fitzpatrick |
| Bridenstine | Collins (GA) | Fleischmann |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Fleming | Levin | Rogers (KY) | Bishop (NY) | Hahn | Pascrell | Hinojosa | Miller (MI) | Serrano |
| Flores | Lewis | Rogers (MI) | Blumenauer | Hanabusa | Payne | Holding | Mullin | Sessions |
| Forbes | LoBiondo | Rooney | Bonamici | Hanna | Pelosi | Hudson | Mulvaney | Sewell (AL) |
| Foster | Long | Ros-Lehtinen | Brady (PA) | Heck (WA) | Perlmutter | Huelskamp | Murphy (PA) | Shea-Porter |
| Fox | Lucas | Roskam | Brady (TX) | Higgins | Peters (CA) | Huizenga (MI) | Neugebauer | Shimkus |
| Franks (AZ) | Luetkemeyer | Ross | Braley (IA) | Holt | Peters (MI) | Hultgren | Noem | Shuster |
| Frelinghuysen | Marchant | Rothfus | Brown (FL) | Horsford | Peterson | Hunter | Nugent | Simpson |
| Fudge | Marino | Royce | Brownley (CA) | Hoyer | Pingree (ME) | Hurt | Nunes | Smith (MO) |
| Gallego | Matheson | Ruiz | Bustos | Huffman | Pitts | Issa | Nunnelee | Smith (NE) |
| Garcia | McCarthy (CA) | Runyan | Butterfield | Israel | Pocan | Jenkins | Olson | Smith (NJ) |
| Gerlach | McCaul | Ryan (WI) | Capps | Jackson Lee | Polis | Johnson (OH) | Palazzo | Smith (TX) |
| Gibbs | McHenry | Scalise | Capuano | Jeffries | Price (NC) | Jones | Pastor (AZ) | Southerland |
| Gingrey (GA) | McIntyre | Schock | Cárdenas | Johnson (GA) | Quigley | Jordan | Paulsen | Stewart |
| Gohmert | McKeon | Scott, Austin | Carney | Johnson, E. B. | Rahall | Joyce | Pearce | Stivers |
| Goodlatte | McKinley | Scott, David | Carson (IN) | Johnson, Sam | Rangel | Kelly (PA) | Perry | Stockman |
| Gosar | McMorris | Sensenbrenner | Cartwright | Kaptur | Reed | King (IA) | Petri | Stutzman |
| Granger | Rodgers | Sessions | Cassidy | Keating | Reichert | King (NY) | Pittenger | Terry |
| Graves (MO) | Meadows | Shimkus | Castor (FL) | Kelly (IL) | Richmond | Kingston | Poe (TX) | Thompson (PA) |
| Green, Gene | Meeks | Shuster | Castro (TX) | Kennedy | Rigell | Kinzinger (IL) | Pompeo | Thornberry |
| Griffin (AR) | Messer | Simpson | Chabot | Kildee | Roybal-Allard | Kline | Posey | Tiberi |
| Grimm | Mica | Sinema | Chu | Kilmer | Ruiz | Labrador | Price (GA) | Tipton |
| Hall | Miller (FL) | Smith (MO) | Cicilline | Kind | Runyan | LaMalfa | Radel | Turner |
| Harper | Miller (MI) | Smith (NE) | Clarke | Kirkpatrick | Ruppersberger | Lamborn | Renacci | Upton |
| Hartzler | Mullin | Smith (NJ) | Clay | Kuster | Rush | Lankford | Ribble | Valadao |
| Heck (NV) | Murphy (FL) | Smith (TX) | Cleaver | Lance | Sánchez, Linda T. | Larson (CT) | Rice (SC) | Velázquez |
| Hensarling | Murphy (PA) | Southerland | Clyburn | Langevin | Sanchez, Loretta | Latham | Roby | Walberg |
| Hinojosa | Neugebauer | Terry | Cohen | Lee (CA) | Sanford | Latta | Rogers (TN) | Walden |
| Holding | Noem | Thompson (MS) | Connolly | Levin | Sarbanes | LoBiondo | Rogers (AL) | Walorski |
| Hudson | Nugent | Thompson (PA) | Conyers | Lewis | Schakowsky | Rogers (KY) | Rogers (MI) | Weber (TX) |
| Huizenga (MI) | Nunes | Thornberry | Cooper | Lipinski | Schiff | Lucas | Rohrabacher | Webster (FL) |
| Hultgren | Nunnelee | Tiberi | Costa | Loeb | Schneider | Luetkemeyer | Rokita | Wenstrup |
| Issa | Olson | Turner | Crowley | Lofgren | Schock | Lynch | Rooney | Westmoreland |
| Jenkins | Owens | Upton | Cuellar | Lowenthal | Schrader | Marchant | Ros-Lehtinen | Whitfield |
| Johnson (OH) | Palazzo | Veasey | Cummings | Lowe | Schwartz | Marino | Roskam | Williams |
| Johnson, Sam | Pascrell | Wagner | Davis (CA) | Lujan Grisham (NM) | Scott (VA) | McCaul | Ross | Wilson (SC) |
| Jordan | Pearce | Walberg | Davis, Danny | Luján, Ben Ray (NM) | Scott, David | McClintock | Rothfus | Wittman |
| Joyce | Perry | Walorski | DeFazio | Lummis | Sherman | McHenry | Royce | Wolf |
| Kaptur | Pittenger | Wasserman | DeGette | Maffei | Sinema | McKeon | Ryan (OH) | Woodall |
| Keating | Pitts | Schultz | Delaney | Maloney, Sean | Sires | McKinley | Ryan (WI) | Yoder |
| Kelly (PA) | Pompeo | Weber (TX) | DelBene | Maloney, Carolyn | Smith (WA) | McMorris | Salmon | Yoho |
| King (IA) | Price (GA) | Webster (FL) | Deutsch | Maloney, Sean | Speier | Rodgers | Scalise | Young (AK) |
| King (NY) | Rahall | Williams | Dingell | Massie | Swalwell (CA) | Meadows | Schweikert | Young (FL) |
| Kingston | Rangel | Wilson (SC) | Doggett | Matheson | Takano | Messer | Scott, Austin | |
| Kinzinger (IL) | Reichert | Wittman | Doyle | Duckworth | Thompson (CA) | Mica | Sensenbrenner | |
| Kirkpatrick | Renacci | Wolf | Edwards | Ellison | Thompson (MS) | Miller (FL) | | |
| LaMalfa | Richmond | Womack | Enyart | McCarthy (CA) | Tierney | | | |
| Lamborn | Rigell | Yoder | Eshoo | McDermott | Titus | | | |
| Lance | Roby | Yoho | Farr | McGovern | Herrera Beutler | | | |
| Lankford | Roe (TN) | Young (FL) | Fattah | McIntyre | | | | |
| Latham | Rogers (AL) | | Fitzpatrick | McNerney | | | | |
| Latta | | | Foster | Meehan | | | | |

NOT VOTING—9

| | | |
|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Hastings (FL) | Larsen (WA) | Miller, Gary |
| Herrera Beutler | Markey | Slaughter |
| Honda | McCarthy (NY) | Waters |

□ 1045

Mrs. BEATTY changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 219, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]

AYES—206

| | | |
|---------|---------|-------------|
| Andrews | Bass | Benishek |
| Bachus | Beatty | Bera (CA) |
| Barber | Becerra | Bishop (GA) |

NOES—219

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Aderholt | Chaffetz | Fleischmann |
| Alexander | Coble | Fleming |
| Amash | Coffman | Flores |
| Amodei | Cole | Forbes |
| Bachmann | Collins (GA) | Fortenberry |
| Barletta | Collins (NY) | Fox |
| Barr | Conaway | Franks (AZ) |
| Barrow (GA) | Cook | Fudge |
| Barton | Cotton | Gabbard |
| Bentivolio | Courtney | Gardner |
| Bilirakis | Cramer | Garrett |
| Bishop (UT) | Crawford | Gibbs |
| Black | Crenshaw | Gingrey (GA) |
| Blackburn | Culberson | Gohmert |
| Bonner | Daines | Gowdy |
| Boustany | Davis, Rodney | Granger |
| Bridenstine | DeLauro | Graves (GA) |
| Brooks (AL) | Denham | Graves (MO) |
| Brooks (IN) | DeSantis | Griffith (VA) |
| Broun (GA) | DesJarlais | Grimm |
| Buchanan | Diaz-Balart | Guthrie |
| Bucshon | Duffy | Hall |
| Burgess | Duncan (SC) | Harper |
| Calvert | Duncan (TN) | Harris |
| Camp | Ellmers | Hartzler |
| Campbell | Engel | Hastings (WA) |
| Cantor | Esty | Heck (NV) |
| Capito | Farenthold | Hensarling |
| Carter | Fincher | Himes |

NOT VOTING—9

| | | |
|-----------------|-------------|---------------|
| Gutiérrez | Honda | McCarthy (NY) |
| Hastings (FL) | Larsen (WA) | Miller, Gary |
| Herrera Beutler | Markey | Slaughter |

□ 1050

Ms. MOORE changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. MARINO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 230, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 271]

AYES—194

| | | |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Aderholt | Bilirakis | Brooks (AL) |
| Alexander | Bishop (GA) | Brooks (IN) |
| Amash | Bishop (UT) | Broun (GA) |
| Amodei | Black | Buchanan |
| Bachmann | Blackburn | Bucshon |
| Barletta | Bonner | Burgess |
| Barton | Boustany | Calvert |
| Benishek | Brady (TX) | Camp |
| Bentivolio | Bridenstine | Campbell |

Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gohmert
Gosar
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding

NOES—230

Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)

Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Hanabusa
Harper
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)

Barr
Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Honda

Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson

NOT VOTING—10

Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Meeks

Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Yarmuth

Miller, Gary
Slaughter

Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cotton
Culberson
Daines
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)

Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Tipton
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)

NOES—269

Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Enyart
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw

Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Goodlatte
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez

Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn

Mr. FINCHER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BARR. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 271, I was unavoidably detained with a constituent and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 269, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 272]

AYES—156

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barton
Benishak
Bentivolio
Bilirakis

Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)

Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy

Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Enyart
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw

Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Goodlatte
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez

Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn

Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis

Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradner
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)

Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Cooper
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs

Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebbeck
Long
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica

Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney

Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg

Walden
Walorski
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams

Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—81

Barrow (GA)
Bass
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Brownley (CA)
Campbell
Capps
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Chu
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costa
Crawford
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Denham
Eshoo
Farr
Gallego
Garamendi
García
Graves (MO)
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hinojosa

Hudson
Huffman
Hunter
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Kildee
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lee (CA)
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lucas
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McIntyre
McNerney
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nugent

Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Sanchez, Loretta
Schiff
Schrader
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sherman
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Valadao
Vargas
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Yoho

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Castro (TX)

NOT VOTING—9

Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Honda

Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Markey

McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Slaughter

□ 1101

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 227, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

AYES—197

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Barr
Barrow (GA)

Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert

NOT VOTING—9

Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Honda

Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)

Miller, Gary
Ryan (OH)
Slaughter

□ 1058

Mr. TIBERI changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PITTENGER. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 272, McClintock Amendment No. 92, I inadvertently voted "no" and intended to vote "yes." Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. GIBSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 343, noes 81, answered "present" 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

AYES—343

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews

Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr

Barton
Beatty
Benishak
Bentivoglio
Bilirakis

Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter

NOES—227

Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishkek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa

Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey

Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Tiberi
Tipton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Levin
Lewis
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMorris
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens

NOT VOTING—10

Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler

Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)

Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Esty
Scott, David
Serrano
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho

Miller, Gary
Slaughter

Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Forbes
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes

Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nugent
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)

NOES—218

Aderholt
Amash
Amodel
Bachmann
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishkek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)

Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Richmond
Rigell
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schraeder
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

Mr. WESTMORELAND changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 274 I inadvertently voted “yes” when I intended to oppose the amendment. I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 218, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

AYES—208

Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)

Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)

Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney

Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)

Congressman
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| Labrador | Nunes | Scott, Austin | DeGette | Kuster | Radel | Lujan Grisham | Poe (TX) | Stivers |
| LaMalfa | Nunnelee | Sensenbrenner | Delaney | Lamborn | Rangel | (NM) | Pompeo | Stutzman |
| Lamborn | Olson | Sessions | DeLauro | Lance | Rigell | Maffei | Posey | Takano |
| Lankford | Owens | Shimkus | Dent | Langevin | Rogers (MI) | Maloney, Sean | Rahall | Thompson (CA) |
| Latham | Palazzo | Shuster | DeSantis | Larson (CT) | Rohrabacher | Marino | Reed | Thompson (MS) |
| Latta | Paulsen | Simpson | Dingell | Lee (CA) | Rokita | Matsui | Reichert | Thompson (PA) |
| Lofgren | Pearce | Sinema | Doggett | Levin | Rothfus | McCarthy (CA) | Renacci | Thornberry |
| Long | Perry | Smith (MO) | Doyle | Lewis | Roybal-Allard | McCaul | Ribble | Tiberi |
| Lucas | Peters (MI) | Smith (NE) | Duncan (TN) | LoBiondo | Royce | McHenry | Rice (SC) | Tipton |
| Luetkemeyer | Petri | Smith (TX) | Edwards | Lofgren | Runyan | McIntyre | Richmond | Turner |
| Lujan Grisham | Pittenger | Southerland | Ellison | Lowenthal | Ruppersberger | McKeon | Roby | Upton |
| (NM) | Pitts | Stewart | Engel | Lowe | Rush | McMorris | Roe (TN) | Valadao |
| Luján, Ben Ray | Poe (TX) | Stivers | Eshoo | Luján, Ben Ray | Ryan (OH) | Rodgers | Rogers (AL) | Veasey |
| (NM) | Polis | Stockman | Esty | (NM) | Ryan (WI) | McNerney | Rogers (KY) | Vela |
| Lummis | Pompeo | Stutzman | Fattah | Lummis | Salmon | Meehan | Rooney | Wagner |
| Maffei | Posey | Terry | Fleischmann | Lynch | Sánchez, Linda | Messer | Ros-Lehtinen | Walberg |
| Maloney, Sean | Price (GA) | Thompson (PA) | Fox | Maloney, | T. | Miller (MI) | Roskam | Walden |
| Marchant | Radel | Thornberry | Franks (AZ) | Carolyn | Sanford | Mullin | Ross | Walorski |
| Marino | Renacci | Tiberi | Frelinghuysen | Marchant | Sarbanes | Mulvaney | Ruiz | Walz |
| Massie | Ribble | Tipton | Fudge | Massie | Scalise | Murphy (FL) | Sanchez, Loretta | Weber (TX) |
| Matheson | Rice (SC) | Tonko | Garrett | Matheson | Schakowsky | Murphy (PA) | Schock | Weber (FL) |
| Matsui | Roby | Upton | Gingrey (GA) | McClintock | Schiff | Neal | Scott, Austin | Welch |
| McCarthy (CA) | Roe (TN) | Valadao | Graves (GA) | McCollum | Schneider | Negrete McLeod | Sessions | Wenstrup |
| McCaul | Rogers (AL) | Wagner | Grayson | McDermott | Schrader | Neugebauer | Sewell (AL) | Westmoreland |
| McClintock | Rogers (KY) | Walberg | Green, Al | McGovern | Schwartz | Noem | Shimkus | Whitfield |
| McHenry | Rogers (MI) | Walden | Green, Gene | McKinley | Schwartz | Nolan | Shuster | Williams |
| McKeon | Rohrabacher | Webster (TX) | Grijalva | Meadows | Schweikert | Nugent | Simpson | Wilson (SC) |
| McKinley | Rokita | Webster (FL) | Gutiérrez | Meeks | Scott (VA) | Nunes | Sinema | Wittman |
| McMorris | Rooney | Wenstrup | Hahn | Meng | Scott, David | Nunnelee | Smith (MO) | Womack |
| Rodgers | Roskam | Westmoreland | Hanabusa | Mica | Sensenbrenner | Owens | Smith (NE) | Yoder |
| Meadows | Ross | Whitfield | Harris | Michaud | Shea-Porter | Pastor (AZ) | Smith (NJ) | Yoho |
| Meehan | Rothfus | Williams | Heck (WA) | Miller (FL) | Sherman | Pearce | Smith (TX) | Young (AK) |
| Messer | Royce | Wilson (SC) | Hensarling | Miller, George | Sires | Perlmutter | Southerland | |
| Mica | Ruiz | Womack | Higgins | Moore | Smith (WA) | Peterson | Stewart | |
| Miller (MI) | Runyan | Woodall | Himes | Moran | Speier | | | |
| Mullin | Ryan (WI) | Yoder | Holding | Nadler | Stockman | | | |
| Mulvaney | Salmon | Young (FL) | Holt | Napolitano | Swalwell (CA) | | | |
| Murphy (PA) | Sanford | Young (IN) | Horsford | O'Rourke | Terry | | | |
| Neugebauer | Schock | | Hoyer | Olson | Tierney | | | |
| Noem | Schweikert | | Hudson | Palazzo | Titus | | | |
| | | | Hunter | Pallone | Tonko | | | |
| | | | Israel | Pascrell | Tsongas | | | |
| | | | Paulsen | Payne | Van Hollen | | | |
| | | | Issa | Pelosi | Velázquez | | | |
| | | | Jackson Lee | Perry | Visclosky | | | |
| | | | Jeffries | Peters (CA) | Wasserman | | | |
| | | | Johnson, Sam | Peters (MI) | Schultz | | | |
| | | | Jones | Petri | Waters | | | |
| | | | Jordan | Pingree (ME) | Watt | | | |
| | | | Kaptur | Pittenger | Waxman | | | |
| | | | Keating | Pitts | Wilson (FL) | | | |
| | | | Kelly (IL) | Pocan | Wolf | | | |
| | | | Kennedy | Polis | Woodall | | | |
| | | | Kilmer | Price (GA) | Yarmuth | | | |
| | | | Kind | Price (NC) | Young (FL) | | | |
| | | | Kingston | Quigley | Young (IN) | | | |
| | | | Kline | | | | | |

NOT VOTING—8

| | | |
|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Hastings (FL) | Larsen (WA) | Miller, Gary |
| Herrera Beutler | Markey | Slaughter |
| Honda | McCarthy (NY) | |

□ 1109

Mr. GOODLATTE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. KIND

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 217, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—208

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Amash | Bridenstine | Clarke |
| Andrews | Brooks (AL) | Clay |
| Bachus | Broun (GA) | Coffman |
| Bass | Brown (FL) | Cohen |
| Beatty | Burgess | Collins (GA) |
| Becerra | Capps | Connolly |
| Bentivolio | Cardenas | Conyers |
| Bilirakis | Carney | Cooper |
| Bishop (NY) | Cartwright | Courtney |
| Black | Castor (FL) | Crowley |
| Blackburn | Chabot | Cummings |
| Blumenauer | Chaffetz | Davis (CA) |
| Bonamici | Chu | Davis, Danny |
| Brady (PA) | Cicilline | DeFazio |

| | |
|---------------|----------------|
| DeGette | Kuster |
| Delaney | Lamborn |
| DeLauro | Lance |
| Dent | Langevin |
| DeSantis | Larson (CT) |
| Dingell | Lee (CA) |
| Doggett | Levin |
| Doyle | Lewis |
| Duncan (TN) | LoBiondo |
| Edwards | Lofgren |
| Ellison | Lowenthal |
| Engel | Lowe |
| Eshoo | Luján, Ben Ray |
| Esty | (NM) |
| Fattah | Lummis |
| Fleischmann | Lynch |
| Fox | Maloney, |
| Franks (AZ) | Carolyn |
| Frelinghuysen | Marchant |
| Fudge | Massie |
| Garrett | Matheson |
| Gingrey (GA) | McClintock |
| Graves (GA) | McCollum |
| Grayson | McDermott |
| Green, Al | McGovern |
| Green, Gene | McKinley |
| Grijalva | Meadows |
| Gutiérrez | Meeks |
| Hahn | Meng |
| Hanabusa | Mica |
| Harris | Michaud |
| Heck (WA) | Miller (FL) |
| Hensarling | Miller, George |
| Higgins | Moore |
| Himes | Moran |
| Holding | Nadler |
| Holt | Napolitano |
| Horsford | O'Rourke |
| Hoyer | Olson |
| Hudson | Palazzo |
| Huffman | Pallone |
| Hunter | Pascrell |
| Israel | Paulsen |
| Issa | Payne |
| Jackson Lee | Pelosi |
| Jeffries | Perry |
| Johnson, Sam | Peters (CA) |
| Jones | Peters (MI) |
| Jordan | Petri |
| Kaptur | Pingree (ME) |
| Keating | Pittenger |
| Kelly (IL) | Pitts |
| Kennedy | Pocan |
| Kilmer | Polis |
| Kind | Price (GA) |
| Kingston | Price (NC) |
| Kline | Quigley |

NOES—217

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Aderholt | Costa | Gowdy |
| Alexander | Cotton | Granger |
| Amodei | Cramer | Graves (MO) |
| Bachmann | Crawford | Griffin (AR) |
| Barber | Crenshaw | Griffith (VA) |
| Barletta | Cuellar | Grimm |
| Barr | Culberson | Guthrie |
| Barrow (GA) | Daines | Hall |
| Barton | Davis, Rodney | Hanna |
| Benishek | DelBene | Harper |
| Bera (CA) | Denham | Hartzler |
| Bishop (GA) | DesJarlais | Hastings (WA) |
| Bishop (UT) | Deutch | Heck (NV) |
| Bonner | Diaz-Balart | Hinojosa |
| Boustany | Duckworth | Huelskamp |
| Brady (TX) | Duffy | Huizenga (MI) |
| Braley (IA) | Duncan (SC) | Hultgren |
| Brooks (IN) | Ellmers | Hurt |
| Brownley (CA) | Enyart | Jenkins |
| Buchanan | Farenthold | Johnson (GA) |
| Buchson | Farr | Johnson (OH) |
| Bustos | Fincher | Johnson, E. B. |
| Butterfield | Fitzpatrick | Joyce |
| Calvert | Fleming | Kelly (PA) |
| Camp | Flores | Kildee |
| Campbell | Forbes | Bishop (NY) |
| Cantor | Fortenberry | King (IA) |
| Capito | Foster | King (NY) |
| Capuano | Frankel (FL) | Kinzie (IL) |
| Carson (IN) | Gabbard | Kirkpatrick |
| Carter | Gallego | Labrador |
| Cassidy | Garamendi | LaMalfa |
| Castro (TX) | Garcia | Lankford |
| Cleaver | Gardner | Latham |
| Clyburn | Gerlach | Latta |
| Coble | Lipinski | Lofgren |
| Cole | Loeb | Loeb |
| Collins (NY) | Gibson | Long |
| Conaway | Gohmert | Lucas |
| Cook | Goodlatte | Luetkemeyer |
| | Gosar | |

NOT VOTING—9

| | | |
|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Hastings (FL) | Larsen (WA) | Miller, Gary |
| Herrera Beutler | Markey | Slaughter |
| Honda | McCarthy (NY) | Vargas |

□ 1114

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 252, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

AYES—174

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| Amash | Castro (TX) | Doyle |
| Andrews | Chabot | Duncan (SC) |
| Bass | Chaffetz | Duncan (TN) |
| Becerra | Chu | Edwards |
| Bilirakis | Cicilline | Ellison |
| Bishop (NY) | Coffman | Eshoo |
| Bishop (UT) | Connolly | Fattah |
| Blumenauer | Cook | Fleischmann |
| Brady (PA) | Cooper | Fleming |
| Brady (TX) | Cotton | Fox |
| Bridenstine | Courtney | Franks (AZ) |
| Brooks (AL) | Crowley | Frelinghuysen |
| Broun (GA) | Daines | Fudge |
| Brown (FL) | Davis (CA) | Gabbard |
| Cantor | Davis, Danny | Garamendi |
| Capps | DeFazio | Garcia |
| Capuano | DeLauro | Garrett |
| Cartwright | Dent | Gingrey (GA) |
| Cassidy | DeSantis | Goodlatte |
| | Dingell | Gowdy |

Graves (GA) Maloney,
Grijalva Carolyn
Gutiérrez Massie
Hahn Matheson
Hanabusa McCaul
Hanna McClintock
Heck (WA) McGovern
Hensarling Meadows
Higgins Meehan
Himes Meeks
Holt Meng
Hoyer Michaud
Huffman Miller (FL)
Hurt Miller, George
Israel Moore
Issa Moran
Johnson, E. B. Mulvaney
Johnson, Sam Murphy (FL)
Jones Napolitano
Jordan Neal
Kaptur O'Rourke
Keating Pallone
Kennedy Pascrell
Kilmer Paulsen
Kind Payne
Kingston Pelosi
Kuster Perlmutter
Lamborn Peters (CA)
Lance Petri
Langevin Pingree (ME)
Larson (CT) Pitts
Lee (CA) Pocan
Levin Poe (TX)
Lewis Polis
Lipinski Price (GA)
LoBlundo Quigley
Lowey Radel
Lynch Rangel
Rigell

NOES—252

Aderholt Denham
Alexander DesJarlais
Amodei Deutch
Bachmann Diaz-Balart
Bachus Doggett
Barber Duckworth
Barletta Duffy
Barr Ellmers
Barrow (GA) Engel
Barton Enyart
Beatty Esty
Benishek Farenthold
Bentivolio Farr
Bera (CA) Fincher
Bishop (GA) Fitzpatrick
Black Flores
Blackburn Forbes
Bonamici Fortenberry
Bonner Foster
Boustany Frankel (FL)
Braley (IA) Gallego
Brooks (IN) Gardner
Brownley (CA) Gerlach
Buchanan Gibbs
Bucshon Gibson
Burgess Gohmert
Bustos Gosar
Butterfield Granger
Calvert Graves (MO)
Camp Grayson
Campbell Green, Al
Capito Green, Gene
Cárdenas Griffin (AR)
Carson (IN) Griffith (VA)
Carter Grimm
Castor (FL) Guthrie
Clarke Hall
Clay Harper
Clever Harris
Clyburn Hartzler
Coble Hastings (WA)
Cohen Heck (NV)
Cole Hinojosa
Collins (GA) Holding
Collins (NY) Horsford
Conaway Hudson
Conyers Huelskamp
Costa Huizenga (MI)
Cramer Hultgren
Crawford Hunter
Crenshaw Jackson Lee
Cuellar Jeffries
Culberson Jenkins
Cummings Johnson (GA)
Davis, Rodney Johnson (OH)
DeGette Joyce
Delaney Kelly (IL)
DeBene Kelly (PA)

Rohrabacher
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wagner
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Young (FL)

Pittenger
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Honda

NOT VOTING—8

Larsen (WA) Miller, Gary
Markay Slaughter
McCarthy (NY)

□ 1118

Mrs. BLACK changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 23 to the end that the amendment stand rejected in accordance with the previous voice vote thereon.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Without objection, the request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 23 is withdrawn, and the amendment stands rejected in accordance with the previous voice vote thereon.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 99 printed in part B of House Report 113-117.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have amendment No. 99 at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike part I of subtitle D (Dairy) of title I and insert the following new part:

PART I—DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 1401. DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Subtitle E of title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8771 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 1511. DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ACTUAL DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN.—The term ‘actual dairy producer margin’ means the difference between the all-milk price and

the average feed cost, as calculated under subsection (b)(2).

“(2) ALL-MILK PRICE.—The term ‘all-milk price’ means the average price received, per hundredweight of milk, by dairy producers for all milk sold to plants and dealers in the United States, as reported by the National Agricultural Statistics Service.

“(3) AVERAGE FEED COST.—The term ‘average feed cost’ means the average cost of feed used by a dairy operation to produce a hundredweight of milk, determined under subsection (b)(1) using the sum of the following:

“(A) The product determined by multiplying—

“(i) 1.0728; by

“(ii) the price of corn per bushel.

“(B) The product determined by multiplying—

“(i) 0.00735; by

“(ii) the price of soybean meal per ton.

“(C) The product determined by multiplying—

“(i) 0.0137; by

“(ii) the price of alfalfa hay per ton.

“(4) CONSECUTIVE 2-MONTH PERIOD.—The term ‘consecutive 2-month period’ refers to the 2-month period consisting of the months of January and February, March and April, May and June, July and August, September and October, or November and December, respectively.

“(5) DAIRY PRODUCER.—The term ‘dairy producer’ means an individual or entity that directly or indirectly (as determined by the Secretary)—

“(A) shares in the risk of producing milk; and

“(B) makes contributions (including land, labor, management, equipment, or capital) to the dairy operation of the individual or entity that are at least commensurate with the share of the individual or entity of the proceeds of the operation.

“(6) MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.—The term ‘margin insurance program’ means the dairy producer margin insurance program required by this section.

“(7) PARTICIPATING DAIRY PRODUCER.—The term ‘participating dairy producer’ means a dairy producer that registers under subsection (d)(2) to participate in the margin insurance program.

“(8) PRODUCTION HISTORY.—The term ‘production history’ means the quantity of annual milk marketings determined for a dairy producer under subsection (e)(1).

“(9) UNITED STATES.—The term ‘United States’, in a geographical sense, means the 50 States.

“(b) CALCULATION OF AVERAGE FEED COST AND ACTUAL DAIRY PRODUCER MARGINS.—

“(1) CALCULATION OF AVERAGE FEED COST.—The Secretary shall calculate the national average feed cost for each month using the following data:

“(A) The price of corn for a month shall be the price received during that month by agricultural producers in the United States for corn, as reported in the monthly Agriculture Prices report by the Secretary.

“(B) The price of soybean meal for a month shall be the central Illinois price for soybean meal, as reported in the Market News – Monthly Soybean Meal Price Report by the Secretary.

“(C) The price of alfalfa hay for a month shall be the price received during that month by agricultural producers in the United States for alfalfa hay, as reported in the monthly Agriculture Prices report by the Secretary.

“(2) CALCULATION OF ACTUAL DAIRY PRODUCER MARGINS.—The Secretary shall calculate the actual dairy producer margin for each consecutive 2-month period by subtracting—

“(A) the average feed cost for that consecutive 2-month period, determined in accordance with paragraph (1); from

“(B) the all-milk price for that consecutive 2-month period.

“(C) ESTABLISHMENT OF DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish and administer a dairy producer margin insurance program for the purpose of protecting dairy producer income by paying participating dairy producers margin insurance payments when actual dairy producer margins are less than the threshold levels for the payments.

“(d) ELIGIBILITY AND REGISTRATION OF DAIRY PRODUCERS FOR MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) ELIGIBILITY.—All dairy producers in the United States shall be eligible to participate in the margin insurance program.

“(2) REGISTRATION PROCESS.—

“(A) REGISTRATION.—

“(i) ANNUAL REGISTRATION.—On an annual basis, the Secretary shall register all interested dairy producers in the margin insurance program.

“(ii) MANNER AND FORM.—The Secretary shall specify the manner and form by which a dairy producer shall register for the margin insurance program.

“(B) TREATMENT OF MULTI-PRODUCER OPERATIONS.—If a dairy operation consists of more than 1 dairy producer, all of the dairy producers of the operation shall be treated as a single dairy producer for purposes of—

“(i) purchasing margin insurance; and

“(ii) payment of producer premiums under subsection (f)(4).

“(C) TREATMENT OF PRODUCERS WITH MULTIPLE DAIRY OPERATIONS.—If a dairy producer operates 2 or more dairy operations, each dairy operation of the producer shall require a separate registration to participate and purchase margin insurance.

“(3) TIME FOR REGISTRATION.—

“(A) EXISTING DAIRY PRODUCERS.—During the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, a dairy producer that is actively engaged in a dairy operation as of that date may register with the Secretary to participate in the margin insurance program.

“(B) NEW ENTRANTS.—A dairy producer that has no existing interest in a dairy operation as of the date of enactment of this section, but that, after that date, establishes a new dairy operation, may register with the Secretary during the 180-day period beginning on the date on which the dairy operation first markets milk commercially to participate in the margin insurance program.

“(4) RETROACTIVITY.—

“(A) NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF RETROACTIVE PROTECTION.—Not later than 30 days after the effective date of this section, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register to inform dairy producers of the availability of retroactive margin insurance, subject to the condition that interested producers must file a notice of intent (in such form and manner as the Secretary specifies in the Federal Register notice) to participate in the margin insurance program.

“(B) RETROACTIVE MARGIN INSURANCE.—

“(i) AVAILABILITY.—If a dairy producer files a notice of intent under subparagraph (A) to participate in the margin insurance program before the initiation of the sign-up period for the margin insurance program and subsequently signs up for the margin insurance program, the producer shall receive margin insurance retroactive to the effective date of this section.

“(ii) DURATION.—Retroactive margin insurance under this paragraph for a dairy producer shall apply from the effective date of

this section until the date on which the producer signs up for the margin insurance program.

“(C) NOTICE OF INTENT AND OBLIGATION TO PARTICIPATE.—In no way does filing a notice of intent under this paragraph obligate a dairy producer to sign up for the margin insurance program once the program rules are final, but if a producer does file a notice of intent and subsequently signs up for the margin insurance program, that dairy producer is obligated to pay premiums for any retroactive margin insurance selected in the notice of intent.

“(5) RECONSTITUTION.—The Secretary shall ensure that a dairy producer does not reconstitute a dairy operation for the sole purpose of purchasing margin insurance.

“(e) PRODUCTION HISTORY OF PARTICIPATING DAIRY PRODUCERS.—

“(1) DETERMINATION OF PRODUCTION HISTORY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall determine the production history of the dairy operation of each participating dairy producer in the margin insurance program.

“(B) CALCULATION.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (C) and (D), the production history of a participating dairy producer shall be equal to the highest annual milk marketings of the dairy producer during any 1 of the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the registration of the dairy producer for participation in the margin insurance program.

“(C) UPDATING PRODUCTION HISTORY.—So long as participating producer remains registered, the production history of the participating producer shall be annually updated based on the highest annual milk marketings of the dairy producer during any one of the 3 immediately preceding calendar years.

“(D) NEW PRODUCERS.—If a dairy producer has been in operation for less than 1 year, the Secretary shall determine the initial production history of the dairy producer under subparagraph (B) by extrapolating the actual milk marketings for the months that the dairy producer has been in operation to a yearly amount.

“(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—A participating dairy producer shall provide all information that the Secretary may require in order to establish the production history of the dairy operation of the dairy producer.

“(3) TRANSFER OF PRODUCTION HISTORY.—

“(A) TRANSFER BY SALE.—

“(i) REQUEST FOR TRANSFER.—If an existing dairy producer sells an entire dairy operation to another party, the seller and purchaser may jointly request that the Secretary transfer to the purchaser the interest of the seller in the production history of the dairy operation.

“(ii) TRANSFER.—If the Secretary determines that the seller has sold the entire dairy operation to the purchaser, the Secretary shall approve the transfer and, thereafter, the seller shall have no interest in the production history of the sold dairy operation.

“(B) TRANSFER BY LEASE.—

“(i) REQUEST FOR TRANSFER.—If an existing dairy producer leases an entire dairy operation to another party, the lessor and lessee may jointly request that the Secretary transfer to the lessee for the duration of the term of the lease the interest of the lessor in the production history of the dairy operation.

“(ii) TRANSFER.—If the Secretary determines that the lessor has leased the entire dairy operation to the lessee, the Secretary shall approve the transfer and, thereafter, the lessor shall have no interest for the duration of the term of the lease in the production history of the leased dairy operation.

“(C) COVERAGE LEVEL.—A purchaser or lessee to whom the Secretary transfers a production history under this paragraph may not obtain a different level of margin insurance coverage held by the seller or lessor from whom the transfer was obtained.

“(D) NEW ENTRANTS.—The Secretary may not transfer the production history determined for a dairy producer described in subsection (d)(3)(B) to another person.

“(4) MOVEMENT AND TRANSFER OF PRODUCTION HISTORY.—

“(A) MOVEMENT AND TRANSFER AUTHORIZED.—Subject to subparagraph (B), if a dairy producer moves from 1 location to another location, the dairy producer may maintain the production history associated with the operation.

“(B) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A dairy producer shall notify the Secretary of any move of a dairy operation under subparagraph (A).

“(C) SUBSEQUENT OCCUPATION OF VACATED LOCATION.—A party subsequently occupying a dairy operation location vacated as described in subparagraph (A) shall have no interest in the production history previously associated with the operation at that location.

“(f) MARGIN INSURANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—At the time of the registration of a dairy producer in the margin insurance program under subsection (d) and annually thereafter during the duration of the margin insurance program, an eligible dairy producer may purchase margin insurance.

“(2) SELECTION OF PAYMENT THRESHOLD.—A participating dairy producer purchasing margin insurance shall elect a coverage level in any increment of \$0.50, with a minimum of \$4.00 and a maximum of \$8.00.

“(3) SELECTION OF COVERAGE PERCENTAGE.—A participating dairy producer purchasing margin insurance shall elect a percentage of coverage, equal to not more than 80 percent nor less than 25 percent, of the production history of the dairy operation of the participating dairy producer.

“(4) PRODUCER PREMIUMS.—

“(A) PREMIUMS REQUIRED.—A participating dairy producer that purchases margin insurance shall pay an annual premium equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

“(i) the percentage selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (3);

“(ii) the production history applicable to the dairy producer; and

“(iii) the premium per hundredweight of milk, as specified in the applicable table under paragraph (B) or (C).

“(B) PREMIUM PER HUNDREDWEIGHT FOR FIRST 4 MILLION POUNDS OF PRODUCTION.—For the first 4,000,000 pounds of milk marketings included in the annual production history of a participating dairy operation, the premium per hundredweight corresponding to each coverage level specified in the following table is as follows:

| Coverage Level | Premium per Cwt. |
|----------------|------------------|
| \$4.00 | \$0.000 |
| \$4.50 | \$0.01 |
| \$5.00 | \$0.02 |
| \$5.50 | \$0.035 |
| \$6.00 | \$0.045 |
| \$6.50 | \$0.09 |
| \$7.00 | \$0.18 |
| \$7.50 | \$0.60 |
| \$8.00 | \$0.95 |

“(C) PREMIUM PER HUNDREDWEIGHT FOR PRODUCTION IN EXCESS OF 4 MILLION POUNDS.—For milk marketings in excess of 4,000,000 pounds included in the annual production history of a participating dairy operation,

the premium per hundredweight corresponding to each coverage level is as follows:

| "Coverage Level | Premium per Cwt. |
|-----------------|------------------|
| \$4.00 | \$0.030 |
| \$4.50 | \$0.045 |
| \$5.00 | \$0.066 |
| \$5.50 | \$0.11 |
| \$6.00 | \$0.185 |
| \$6.50 | \$0.29 |
| \$7.00 | \$0.38 |
| \$7.50 | \$0.83 |
| \$8.00 | \$1.06 |

“(D) TIME FOR PAYMENT.—

“(i) FIRST YEAR.—As soon as practicable after a dairy producer registers to participate in the margin insurance program and purchases margin insurance, the dairy producer shall pay the premium determined under subparagraph (A) for the dairy producer for the first calendar year of the margin insurance.

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—When the dairy producer first purchases margin insurance, the dairy producer shall also elect the method by which the dairy producer will pay premiums under this subsection for subsequent years in accordance with 1 of the schedules described in subclauses (II) and (III).

“(II) SINGLE ANNUAL PAYMENT.—The participating dairy producer may elect to pay 100 percent of the annual premium determined under subparagraph (A) for the dairy producer for a calendar year by not later than January 15 of the calendar year.

“(III) SEMI-ANNUAL PAYMENTS.—The participating dairy producer may elect to pay—

“(aa) 50 percent of the annual premium determined under subparagraph (A) for the dairy producer for a calendar year by not later than January 15 of the calendar year; and

“(bb) the remaining 50 percent of the premium by not later than June 15 of the calendar year.

“(5) PRODUCER PREMIUM OBLIGATIONS.—

“(A) PRO-RATION OF FIRST YEAR PREMIUM.—A participating dairy producer that purchases margin insurance after initial registration in the margin insurance program shall pay a pro-rated premium for the first calendar year based on the date on which the producer purchases the coverage.

“(B) SUBSEQUENT PREMIUMS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (A), the annual premium for a participating dairy producer shall be determined under paragraph (4) for each year in which the margin insurance program is in effect.

“(C) LEGAL OBLIGATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), a participating dairy producer that purchases margin insurance shall be legally obligated to pay the applicable premiums for the entire period of the margin insurance program (as provided in the payment schedule elected under paragraph (4)(B)), and may not opt out of the margin insurance program.

“(ii) DEATH.—If the dairy producer dies, the estate of the deceased may cancel the margin insurance and shall not be responsible for any further premium payments.

“(iii) RETIREMENT.—If the dairy producer retires, the producer may request that Secretary cancel the margin insurance if the producer has terminated the dairy operation entirely and certifies under oath that the producer will not be actively engaged in any dairy operation for at least the next 7 years.

“(6) PAYMENT THRESHOLD.—A participating dairy producer with margin insurance shall receive a margin insurance payment when-

ever the average actual dairy producer margin for a consecutive 2-month period is less than the coverage level threshold selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (2).

“(7) MARGIN INSURANCE PAYMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make a margin insurance protection payment to each participating dairy producer whenever the average actual dairy producer margin for a consecutive 2-month period is less than the coverage level threshold selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (2).

“(B) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The margin insurance payment for the dairy operation of a participating dairy producer shall be determined as follows:

“(i) The Secretary shall calculate the difference between—

“(I) the coverage level threshold selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (2); and

“(II) the average actual dairy producer margin for the consecutive 2-month period.

“(ii) The amount determined under clause (i) shall be multiplied by—

“(I) the percentage selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (3); and

“(II) the lesser of—

“(aa) the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(AA) the production history applicable to the producer under subsection (e)(1); by

“(BB) 6; and

“(bb) the actual quantity of milk marketed by the dairy operation of the dairy producer during the consecutive 2-month period.

“(g) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY PREMIUMS.—

“(1) LOSS OF BENEFITS.—A participating dairy producer that is in arrears on premium payments for margin insurance—

“(A) remains legally obligated to pay the premiums; and

“(B) may not receive margin insurance until the premiums are fully paid.

“(2) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary may take such action as is necessary to collect premium payments for margin insurance.

“(h) USE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.—The Secretary shall use the funds, facilities, and the authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out this section.

“(i) DURATION.—The Secretary shall conduct the margin insurance program during the period beginning on October 1, 2013, and ending on September 30, 2018.”

SEC. 1402. RULEMAKING.

(a) PROCEDURE.—The promulgation of regulations for the initiation of the margin insurance program, and for administration of the margin insurance program, shall be made—

(1) without regard to chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act);

(2) without regard to the Statement of Policy of the Secretary of Agriculture effective July 24, 1971 (36 Fed. Reg. 13804), relating to notices of proposed rulemaking and public participation in rulemaking; and

(3) subject to subsection (b), pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) SPECIAL RULEMAKING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) INTERIM RULES AUTHORIZED.—With respect to the margin insurance program, the Secretary may promulgate interim rules under the authority provided in subparagraph (B) of section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code, if the Secretary determines such interim rules to be needed. Any such interim rules for the margin insurance program shall be effective on publication.

(2) FINAL RULES.—With respect to the margin insurance program, the Secretary shall promulgate final rules, with an opportunity for public notice and comment, no later than

21 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL ORDER.—Section 143(a)(2) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7253(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Subsection (b)(2) does not apply to the authority of the Secretary under this subsection.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 5 minutes of my 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) so he may manage that time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to myself.

Mr. Chairman, like Ranking Member PETERSON, I have been closely involved in the debate to modernize our dairy system. In fact, at his request, I joined him and other Members to seek a solution to fix our dairy safety net after our current programs failed our producers. We agree that dairy farmers deserve access to a Dairy Margin Protection Program to ensure their production. However, I cannot support a Dairy Supply Management Program, and that's why I've joined with Congressman SCOTT, Congressman COLLINS, Congressman MORAN, Congressman DUFFY, Congressman POLIS, Congressman COFFMAN, Congressman MEEKS, Congressman ISSA, Congresswoman DEGETTE, Congressman SESSIONS, and Congresswoman LEE to offer this amendment to take out the dairy provision and substitute for it what we have in all of our other commodity programs, and that is an insurance program that will save the taxpayers money, will save the consumers a lot of money, and not have a policy where we are actually having the government go to dairy farmers and say, If you want to get your check, you have to reduce the size of your herd.

I urge Members to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

I offer amendment #99 to remove the Dairy Market Stabilization Program with a bipartisan group of members—D. SCOTT/C. COLLINS/MORAN/DUFFY/POLIS/COFFMAN/MEEKS/ISSA/DEGETTE/SESSIONS/B. LEE.

Like Ranking Member PETERSON, I have been closely involved in the debate to modernize our dairy system. In fact at his request, I joined him and other members to seek a solution to fix our dairy safety net after our current programs failed our producers. We agree that dairy farmers deserve access to a Dairy Margin Protection Program, to insure their production. However, I cannot support a Dairy Supply Management Program.

This highly controversial program would attempt to manage the U.S. milk supply, and in the process penalize both consumers of dairy

products, as well as dairy farmers who want to expand their operations. Production controls or quotas, programs like the stabilization program are designed to limit milk supply in order to raise milk prices. Programs that directly interfere with free and open markets to raise prices will hurt exports, encourage imports, increase dairy prices for consumers and limit industry growth.

Our amendment is better for farmers. Our amendment gives farmers the tools to manage their risk without requiring them to participate in yet another government program. The new Title I programs and our existing insurance programs do not require producers to participate in government supply management, why is dairy different? A lot has been said that supply management has to be included to save the taxpayers' money. Frankly, the Congressional Budget Office has proven this inaccurate. Our bipartisan amendment without supply management saves the taxpayers \$15 million dollars. Farmers, consumers and taxpayers are better without Supply Management and I ask my colleagues to vote for our amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to Mr. VALADAO from California, a new Member who's actually been in the dairy business and is probably the one guy in this place that understands how this works.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Chairman, this has been a tough one for me because I am the only dairy farmer in this room, and it has been a tough issue because I've lived it for the last 15 years. I have seen how programs created by this body have hurt dairy farmers. There have been a lot of programs eliminated in this current farm bill, and that's a good thing. It takes us in a more market-oriented direction.

But what I see here is we're continuing that same path in a small way. This margin insurance, by definition, is an insurance when you lose money. You lose money because you're producing a product consumers aren't buying. If government is going to continue to push money in that direction, we have to make sure that they don't continue to produce that product consumers don't want.

The argument that we're going to miss out on an opportunity to export, if there's an export market and they're producing for that, they will sell that product. But you can't have a subsidized product coming into the marketplace and want to grow that export market again on a subsidized product because you can't continue to produce that product for that price. If we can't compete, we shouldn't be producing it. If it's going to require that margin insurance to make sure it's produced, it's not a long-term market. It's not a stable market. It's not something that we should spend billions of dollars investing in infrastructure that will not compete.

So I think, at the end of the day, that this is probably the best program.

We've gotten rid of MILC. We got rid of the price support. We've gotten rid of a lot of programs that continued production when consumers weren't buying that product.

And with this one, there's a choice. If they choose to take an opportunity to protect their margins so they can stay afloat—because we have to protect American products and make sure that consumers are buying the safest and the greatest product in the world, which I believe is American dairy product—you can't have them continue to produce that product in the name of exports or in the name of whatever. At the end of the day, consumers pay for it because consumers are taxpayers. If you're going to give them money on the backside out of their back pocket through taxes, you're again paying for that product. The product still has to be paid for.

Dairy farmers have to make a profit, but it has to be the right way. And if they're going to get that dollar to continue to produce that product that consumers aren't buying, there has to be somewhere along the line where they cut back and contract in the market.

So I rise in opposition. Mr. GOODLATTE has been a friend of mine and I have watched from afar. I appreciate everything he has done for the industry over the years, but I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It is a very complicated issue, and I have great respect for our ranking member, but it does seem that we ought to be removing government production limits from our dairy program. Expanding distribution markets throughout the world is one of the best ways to grow American business and create jobs, and that should be one of the roles of government; to remove barriers to expansion and growth.

The fact is that the world demand for dairy products is growing at a faster rate than milk production increases in those regions that produce the most milk, like New Zealand and Australia. The U.S. dairy industry is best positioned to benefit from this growing world dairy demand, but this export growth is threatened by the proposed Dairy Market Stabilization Program in this bill. This provision would give USDA the ability to require every dairy producer enrolled in any level of margin insurance protection to reduce production to meet supply quotas.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. MORAN. As a result, domestic dairy producers would be constrained in their ability to respond to international market opportunities, and that results in lower growth and fewer American jobs. It's this type of supply

management plan that has failed in previous farm bills and would have the dangerous effect of stifling export growth. That is why I ask support for the Goodlatte-Scott amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to one of our ranking members, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, the Dairy Security Act in this bill is as a result of 4 years of hard work on a bipartisan basis.

□ 1130

It's intended to provide a strong, market-based safety net that will keep dairy producers afloat while providing stable prices to our consumers.

Simply put, the amendment being offered here, the Goodlatte-Scott amendment, is about American taxpayers fully paying the bill for down prices that occur in down cycles in the dairy industry.

The dairy industry, especially producers, have been victims of these down cycles and the volatility in recent years because the old programs simply don't work and they encourage overproduction.

At the same time, producers have been forced to deal with increased feed costs that have increased from \$2 a bushel to \$7 a bushel, further impacting their bottom line.

The Goodlatte-Scott amendment will neither provide a safety net for producers, nor prevent the volatility in the market because of unpredictable swings. And, again, it's important to understand reform is in the bill.

This amendment would put the taxpayers footing the bill for the insurance program. This amendment will continue to foster the outdated, tired dairy programs that haven't worked.

In California, my home State, the Nation's leading dairy State in the Nation, we've seen over 100 bankruptcies in the last 18 months. The current program isn't good for the dairymen and -women, nor is it good for American consumers.

The Dairy Security Act not only provides more stability for the producer, but the consumer benefits as well. And you should understand this is voluntary. If you want to grow, you can grow. If you don't want to enter the program, you don't have to enter the program. It is voluntary.

I strongly urge, as a third-generation dairy family in California, my colleagues to oppose this amendment and to bring our Federal dairy policies into the 21st century, so dairymen and -women can compete, and American consumers can have milk prices at reasonable levels.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE), America's dairy land, with more dairy farms than any other in the country.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from Mr. VALADAO, my colleague from California, earlier

when he said that they didn't have enough consumers to buy their milk. Well, we've got the opposite problem in Wisconsin.

People want Wisconsin milk, and they want Wisconsin cheese. And it shows the geographical difficulty with this problem and with this underlying bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE seeks to correct those geographical differences by taking the most controversial piece of it out, and I stand here in support of doing that.

You know, our Founders kind of instructed us and said, if you can find agreement in this Chamber, do those things; but if you can't find agreement—and we can't find agreement here—don't do those things.

And so what Mr. GOODLATTE is trying to do is go to the place where we have the most and most broad agreement, leaving the margin insurance element in place for farmers, but stripping out the supply management element where some regions of the country would be damaged by it.

I support the Goodlatte amendment because it's the right type of reform for all Wisconsans and all of this country's dairy producers and processors, not one or the other, but both.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I'm now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), one of our hard workers on this issue.

Mr. WELCH. The question facing this Congress is, Will we have a farm bill that respects farm families?

This is about individual families that are working hard to try to survive, not to get rich.

Market stabilization is exactly what Apple Computer does. If they make and sell more iPods, they produce more. If sales go down, they taper off.

Why not give that market signal to our farmers with second-, third-, fourth-generation families in Vermont, the Kennett family, the Richardson family, the Rowell family?

All they want to do is produce good, nutritious milk for the people in their community. This market stabilization gets them out of the death spiral, where they have absolutely no control over what that price is. And when it plunges, the only opportunity they have to try to survive is to increase production. The price goes down again.

This market stabilization is using the market. It's an ally of the farmer, as it should be. So this makes sense.

And what I am so proud of is that America's farmers, from Vermont to California, worked together to come up with something that would help pass that farm on to the next generation, and it saves money for the taxpayers.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just correct one thing. The Goodlatte-Scott amendment has a very robust safety net program in it. As a matter of fact, it's the same safety net program that is in the bill itself.

Let me make one other point right quick, Mr. Chairman. With the recent

study by Professor Scott Brown, the University of Missouri put in a study that showed if this plan in this bill, this management supply bill, goes into effect, in the first month alone, school lunch program costs will go up \$14 million, and the price of a gallon of milk will go up 32 cents.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan amendment which I am proud to cosponsor.

The underlying farm bill is designed to artificially raise the price of milk. This will have negative consequences for consumers, and that's why the Consumer Federation of America, the National Consumers League, the Consumers Union and other consumer groups, also the Teamsters, oppose the underlying language in this bill and support this amendment.

And when milk prices increase, it disproportionately harms America's poor, working families.

Now, there's a lot in this bill that I cannot support, including the heartless cuts to SNAP. Without this amendment, this bill adds insult to injury. Without this amendment, 246,000 women and children will lose access to milk because of the decrease of milk supply, and also prices, as the Representative from Georgia has so eloquently laid out, the milk prices will rise about 32 cents.

So this amendment protects families whose budgets are already stretched to the limit and they're already being cut in this bill.

So I hope that people understand this bill. There's been a lot of confusion, but this is a good bill that consumers support, that teamsters support; and I urge an "aye" vote on the amendment, not the bill, but the amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I'm going to take 30 seconds right now, and then I'm going to reserve because I'm ahead.

But I just need to stand up and say that this is not true. Scott Brown put out a study on this bill, and they said the effect of this was going to be a half a cent a gallon, maybe a couple of cents a gallon. So where they're coming up with this 30 cents or 50 cents, I have no idea. This is complete fabrication that's made up out of something that I don't know where it comes from.

So people need to understand that. Scott Brown is probably the most respected economist in dairy in the country, and he did not say it was 30 cents or 50 cents.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, what Mr. BROWN said was up to 32 cents a gallon.

At this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to visit on this. I do believe in an individual's

right to earn a living, to start a business, to earn a profit, to grow that business, and to expand to meet new market opportunities without government interference.

And I also believe that should be specifically available to dairy farmers as well.

But in the dairy program before us today, that flies in the face of this right. Government should not have the power to tell dairy farmers that they won't be paid for the milk they produce.

I think it's completely hypocritical for Members of this body to come to the floor and rail against market manipulation by Big Business, then turn around and say Washington should do the same thing.

We should support the Goodlatte-Scott amendment. We should oppose government control and interference in the marketplace, and we should support dairy freedom, growth, and opportunity.

There are numerous dairy families across this country, but one in particular in my district, the McCarty family, please let them have the opportunity to grow their business. Give them that chance. If we adopt the language as is, it will restrict their ability to grow their business.

Mr. PETERSON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, haven't we done enough already in this bill to impact low-income families' access to food?

The U.S. Government purchases 20 percent of domestic milk production for use in anti-hunger programs. So if the price of milk goes up, so does the cost of our nutrition programs like the Supplemental Assistance Nutrition Program; Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, or the WIC program; and the National School Lunch program.

Everybody admits that the effect of the underlying language in the bill will be to raise milk prices.

□ 1140

This is a burden that our low-income families simply cannot afford. We need a balance. We need a balance that will give a safety net to our dairy families but won't take it off of the backs of our low-income folks.

So I would urge a "yes" vote on this amendment. Just like the Consumer Federation of America and so many other groups that Ms. LEE talked about, this is a good thing for consumers, it's a good thing for Americans, and we should have that balance. Vote "yes."

Mr. PETERSON. I'm now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Thank you, Mr. PETERSON.

I rise in strong opposition to the Goodlatte-Scott amendment which would create unnecessary market volatility and uncertainty for our farmers. The Dairy Security Act creates a new, voluntary insurance program and will help consumers by eliminating the price spikes that are common today, ensuring stable milk prices.

There has been a great deal of misinformation about how the Dairy Security Act would affect consumers, but researchers like Dr. Brown at the University of Missouri, estimated milk prices will only rise between one-half of 1 cent to a few cents per gallon. The current volatility in the market is far more harmful to consumers than that very slight increase.

Simply put, it is poor policy to commit funds to a dairy program without fixing the underlying problem of oversupply, which is what this amendment would do. An insurance-only model poorly addresses the symptom of low margins and completely misses the issues of supply and demand. The stabilization program also has safeguards that will protect the U.S. export market, which is critical for dairy producers.

In my district, I've had long conversations with local dairy farmers, been to their farms, and the sentiment is unanimous: dairy farmers oppose this amendment because it will hurt them and consumers. I urge my colleagues to follow their advice and vote "no."

Mr. GOODLATTE. At this time, it's my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM).

Mr. GRIMM. Thank you, chairman.

Today, I rise in strong support of the Goodlatte-Scott amendment. The farm bill, as is, artificially increases the price of milk and cheese. And where I come from, this will devastate my local delis, my specialty food stores and restaurants throughout Staten Island, Brooklyn and throughout our Nation.

As for oversupply, today, New York is America's yogurt capital. That industry accounts for almost \$1 billion—with a B—in economic growth, revenue and 15,000 jobs.

Yet while we repeatedly talk about jobs and entrepreneurship, Chobani yogurt exemplifies this as a true American success story. Started in 2005, Chobani has transformed a groundbreaking new industry of Greek yogurt in America. But without an adequate milk supply at reasonable prices, Chobani, local delis and other companies will have a limited ability to grow and keep their products reasonably priced.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support the Goodlatte amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I'm now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), one of our good champions of the dairy industry.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. GRIMM for mentioning the yogurt

industry. That is very prominent in my district, and we supply milk to many of the yogurt plants. There is no question that Mr. GOODLATTE's amendment would negatively impact that, whereas the Dairy Security Act would have a positive impact on our ability to supply milk to a growing industry that does, in fact, create jobs.

I rise in support of the Dairy Security Act and opposed to this amendment because it represents 4 years of bipartisan compromise worked out between Mr. LUCAS and Mr. PETERSON, and those are the kinds of activities we should be doing in this Congress.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished lady from Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, to the Members of the House, let me be clear, I will not be voting for this bill. I will vote for no bill that cuts \$20.5 billion from the SNAP program, but I will be voting for this amendment.

We had a hideous bill on the floor a couple of days ago. And I want to be clear. I support all children, and it does not end at birth. It is ludicrous that we're here and the goody goody two shoes are now cutting the SNAP program and an attack on children. The families of three can earn no modern \$24,000 per year in income. Seventy-six percent of the SNAP households include a child, an elderly person or a disabled person. Because of the insensitivity of this Congress, there was an announcement in my paper that Meals on Wheels for seniors are being cut.

I am fighting for babies who need milk and families that cannot afford food for their children. Support this amendment and vote against this bad bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will inform the Members that the gentleman from Minnesota has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Georgia's time has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 seconds to my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Chairman, dairy farming is risky business. You've heard that from them themselves. These are the folks that are up at 4 a.m., rain, shine, snow or sleet—doesn't matter—7 days a week, 365 days a year milking cows, and then they do it again 12 hours later. They don't get rich off this. They don't get sick time, and they don't get paid holidays. They get no time off if you want to get to it.

The one thing we can provide them is certainty and take the volatility out of the market to make sure that when they have a bad year, we don't end up liquidating these, consolidating into large dairies and harming the very people that the people who support this amendment claim to support.

I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment and do the right thing for these hardworking Americans.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the Agriculture Committee, to close our debate.

Mr. GIBBS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in support of this amendment. This amendment builds on the reforms in the underlying bill and scraps the proposed "supply management" program. Doing so will allow farmers and dairy producers to expand and meet the growing global demand for American dairy products. It will grow our exports and grow our economy.

It also will protect families and farmers. Families are already having enough trouble making ends meet. This amendment will help bring down prices for our constituents by providing more opportunity and fairness to dairy farmers across the country.

It also will save taxpayers dollars. This amendment saves taxpayers another \$15 million on top of the savings in the underlying bill. Every penny counts.

This amendment will create better and more market-driven policies for our farmers. Supply management is not the way to go. I support the Goodlatte-Scott amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

As has been said, we've been working on this for 4 years. Clearly, the current policy doesn't work because we've got all this volatility. If you adopt this Goodlatte-Scott amendment, you're going to continue to have that volatility.

Now, those people that are concerned about the price of milk, when we had high prices, the processors raised the prices. When the prices collapse \$11, they didn't cut the prices. I've sent out charts to you to explain that. So what people need to understand is what we're trying to do here is give farmers a way to protect themselves against the feed costs and this volatility.

Now, this program is voluntary. Nobody has to get into this program. If they don't like the stabilization fund, they don't have to take the insurance and they don't have to be involved in it. But what we're saying is, if you're going to have the government subsidize your insurance, which is what we're doing, then you're going to have to be responsible if this thing gets out of whack. And what the Goodlatte-Scott amendment does is it puts that responsibility on the taxpayers, not on the farmers, which is irresponsible in my opinion.

The other thing you need to understand is, in regular crop insurance, the prices, you can only ensure the price for that year. But in this amendment, in the Goodlatte-Scott amendment, you ensure the price not based on what the market is, it's based on the feed costs plus the margin. So you're going

to insure milk for \$18 per 100 weight, but if the price goes to \$11, the farmer still can have \$18 insurance. He doesn't care if it's \$11, the government is going to pay for that, not him.

This is a crazy thing that we're talking about doing here. We're putting the responsibility on the taxpayer. We're actually probably going to raise costs to consumers. It's the wrong way to go, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the Goodlatte-Scott amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

□ 1150

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR.
FORTENBERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 100 printed in part B of House Report 113-117.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 1603 and insert the following new sections:

SEC. 1603. PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) LEGAL ENTITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘legal entity’ means—

“(i) an organization that (subject to the requirements of this section and section 1001A) is eligible to receive a payment under a provision of law referred to in subsection (b), (c), or (d);

“(ii) a corporation, joint stock company, association, limited partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, charitable organization, estate, irrevocable trust, grantor of a revocable trust, or other similar entity (as determined by the Secretary); and

“(iii) an organization that is participating in a farming operation as a partner in a general partnership or as a participant in a joint venture.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘legal entity’ does not include a general partnership or joint venture.”;

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (d) and inserting the following:

“(b) LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS FOR COVERED COMMODITIES AND PEANUTS.—The total amount of payments received, directly or indirectly, by a person or legal entity for any crop year for 1 or more covered commodities and peanuts under title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 may not exceed \$125,000, of which—

“(1) not more than \$75,000 may consist of marketing loan gains and loan deficiency payments under subtitle B of title I of the

Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013; and

“(2) not more than \$50,000 may consist of any other payments made for covered commodities and peanuts under title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

“(c) SPOUSAL EQUITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), except as provided in paragraph (2), if a person and the spouse of the person are covered by paragraph (2) and receive, directly or indirectly, any payment or gain covered by this section, the total amount of payments or gains (as applicable) covered by this section that the person and spouse may jointly receive during any crop year may not exceed an amount equal to twice the applicable dollar amounts specified in subsection (b).

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) SEPARATE FARMING OPERATIONS.—In the case of a married couple in which each spouse, before the marriage, was separately engaged in an unrelated farming operation, each spouse shall be treated as a separate person with respect to a farming operation brought into the marriage by a spouse, subject to the condition that the farming operation shall remain a separate farming operation, as determined by the Secretary.

“(B) ELECTION TO RECEIVE SEPARATE PAYMENTS.—A married couple may elect to receive payments separately in the name of each spouse if the total amount of payments and benefits described in subsection (b) that the married couple receives, directly or indirectly, does not exceed an amount equal to twice the applicable dollar amounts specified in those subsections.”;

(3) in paragraph (3)(B) of subsection (f), by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) IRREVOCABLE TRUSTS.—In promulgating regulations to define the term ‘legal entity’ as the term applies to irrevocable trusts, the Secretary shall ensure that irrevocable trusts are legitimate entities that have not been created for the purpose of avoiding a payment limitation.”;

(4) in subsection (h), in the second sentence, by striking “or other entity” and inserting “or legal entity”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e), by striking “subsections (b) and (c)” each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (3)(B) and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(B) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “Subsections (b) and (c)” and inserting “Subsection (b)”;

(ii) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking “subsection (b) or (c)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(iii) in paragraph (5)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subsection (d)”;

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “subsection (b), (c), or (d)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(iv) in paragraph (6)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “Notwithstanding subsection (d), except as provided in subsection (g)” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (f)”;

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “subsections (b), (c), and (d)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(C) in subsection (g)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “subsection (f)(6)(A)” and inserting “subsection (e)(6)(A)”;

(II) by striking “subsection (b) or (c)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “subsections (b) and (c)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(D) by redesignating subsections (e) through (h) as subsections (d) through (g), respectively.

(2) Section 1001A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-1) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “subsections (b) and (c) of section 1001” and inserting “section 1001(b)”;

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “subsection (b) or (c) of section 1001” and inserting “section 1001(b)”.

(3) Section 1001B(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-2(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “subsections (b) and (c) of section 1001” and inserting “section 1001(b)”.

(c) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall apply beginning with the 2014 crop year.

SEC. 1603A. PAYMENTS LIMITED TO ACTIVE FARMERS.

Section 1001A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by striking “or active personal management” each place it appears in subparagraphs (A)(i)(II) and (B)(ii); and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “, as applied to the legal entity, are met by the legal entity, the partners or members making a significant contribution of personal labor or active personal management” and inserting “are met by partners or members making a significant contribution of personal labor, those partners or members”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) the landowner share-rents the land at a rate that is usual and customary”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the share of the payments received by the landowner is commensurate with the share of the crop or income received as rent.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “active personal management or”;

(C) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking “(5)” and all that follows through “(A) IN GENERAL.—A person” and inserting the following:

“(5) CUSTOM FARMING SERVICES.—A person”;

(ii) by inserting “under usual and customary terms” after “services”;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) FARM MANAGERS.—A person who otherwise meets the requirements of this subsection other than (b)(2)(A)(i)(II) shall be considered to be actively engaged in farming, as determined by the Secretary, with respect to the farming operation, including a farming operation that is a sole proprietorship, a legal entity such as a joint venture or general partnership, or a legal entity such as a corporation or limited partnership, if the person—

“(A) makes a significant contribution of management to the farming operation necessary for the farming operation, taking into account—

“(i) the size and complexity of the farming operation; and

“(ii) the management requirements normally and customarily required by similar farming operations;

“(B)(i) is the only person in the farming operation qualifying as actively engaged in farming by using the farm manager special class designation under this paragraph; and

“(ii) together with any other persons in the farming operation qualifying as actively engaged in farming under subsection (b)(2) or as part of a special class under this subsection, does not collectively receive, directly or indirectly, an amount equal to more than the applicable limits under section 1001(b);

“(C) does not use the management contribution under this paragraph to qualify as actively engaged in more than 1 farming operation; and

“(D) manages a farm operation that does not substantially share equipment, labor, or management with persons or legal entities that with the person collectively receive, directly or indirectly, an amount equal to more than the applicable limits under section 1001(b).”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to begin by recognizing the hard work that Chairman LUCAS has put into this bill, as well as Ranking Member PETERSON. A complex bill such as this requires time, dedication, and a willingness to work with Members from a very diverse range of agricultural communities across this Nation, and I appreciate the effort.

I also recognize that many were here very late last night and there is a certain urgency to our deliberations. But I believe it is critically important that we also have a meaningful discussion and debate on the issue of payment limits.

The other legislative body has seen fit to include the language in this amendment in its version of the farm bill, and this amendment gives us the opportunity to send a message that some reform in this area is necessary.

While there is much to commend in this farm bill, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that it falls short of successfully reforming the payment limit system. Without a doubt, agricultural payments are lopsided. Based on the USDA's annual Agricultural Resource Management Survey, the largest 12 percent of farms in terms of gross receipts received more than 62 percent of all government payments in 2009. Such a skewed system, Mr. Chairman, is simply not sustainable in the long run. It leads to the escalation of land prices and accelerates the concentration of land and resources into fewer hands. This is not healthy for rural America.

Continuation of the current system will only lead to greater concentration in agriculture and fewer opportunities for young and beginning farmers. We need a thoughtful and balanced approach here, one that encourages young people to take a chance and gives them some support when they need it, one that doesn't lend itself to the trend of fewer and fewer farms.

Mr. Chairman, we pride ourselves that agriculture is the main bright spot in America's economy. And how did we get here? By ensuring that we

have a vibrant marketplace which depends upon large numbers of producers actively engaged in stewardship of the land.

The amendment I am offering will help farm supports reach their intended recipients as well and close loopholes that benefit investors not actively engaged in farming. It levels the playing field for farm families facing competition from larger operations that do collect the lion's share of government payments.

The amendment reduces farm payment limits, capping commodity payments at \$250,000 for any one farm. That's a lot of subsidy. The legislation will also close loopholes in current law to ensure payments reach their intended recipient, that is, working farmers.

The savings from reforms established in this legislation help ensure that the farm payment system is also set on a more fiscally sustainable trajectory. It's fair to farmers, fair to the taxpayer, and fair to America because it incorporates good governing principles.

This amendment has wide support from a diverse range of agricultural groups, such as the National Farmers Union, the Center for Rural Affairs, National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition, Heritage Action, and Citizens Against Government Waste. They recognize the opportunity we have for meaningful reform here.

Now, it is important, Mr. Chairman, to emphasize that this does not address crop insurance subsidies. That is a completely separate matter, and I recognize the need to differentiate between a program in which producers must contribute their own dollars toward the actuarial success of the program and one that is directly coming from the government.

Mr. Chairman, I have been through two farm bills now, and I've talked to hundreds of farmers in rural America. What they're looking for is simply a chance to compete, and compete well, not a guarantee of unlimited money from the government. We owe it to our hardworking farmers to sustain that fair and robust marketplace.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong opposition to this amendment.

One particular troubling issue is the predefinition of “actively engaged in farming.” My good colleague should know that this will alter, fundamentally, the normal operations on a farm.

Take two quick examples, a brother and a sister. The sister runs the tractors, plants the crops, harvests the crops; the brother, on the other hand, does all the bookkeeping, files tax re-

turns, works with FSA, arranges the loans at the bank. He would no longer be actively engaged in farming. That makes no sense whatsoever.

The broader spread one, though, is the generational shift in farming operations. As parents and grandparents age, they take less of a physical role in farming operations and hand that off to the younger generation—the folks that my good colleague was speaking to. This redefinition would say that as they age out and quit doing the actual physical labor, and yet their wisdom and knowledge and vast experience has added to the success of those farming operations, they would no longer be considered actively engaged in farming and would be excluded from the program itself. This is wrongheaded. It adds additional regulatory burdens on family farms across this country in an unnecessary manner and doesn't get to what my good colleague is trying to get to.

I would strongly urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and vote “no” on the Fortenberry amendment.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. May I can inquire, Mr. Chairman, as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Nebraska has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I'm not out to punish anyone's success. In fact, I celebrate it.

A \$250,000 subsidy is a lot of money to come directly from the government. I think many Americans would agree. We put caps and limits on virtually every other program, so why not this one? What I'm saying is that amount of money should be sufficient.

I would like to offer another example regarding direct engagement in farming that helps clarify the issue that my colleague just raised.

A farm in the Deep South recently received \$440,000—again, none of it to someone actually working the farm, but to six general partners and five spouses, all of whom claim to be providing the management needed to running the farm.

What this bill does, in addition to capping payments, it provides a more enforceable working definition for those actively engaged in farm management, and that's an important reform as well.

Again, this has been worked out in the other legislative body from Members who represent diverse agricultural districts all over this country. I think this is a reasonable reform that, again, is fair to the taxpayers, fair to the farm family, and consistent with good governing principles. It's a balanced, reasonable approach.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the subcommittee chairman of the Agriculture Committee from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment.

In order for farmers in my district to compete, their operations must be economies of scale. This is largely due to the high cost of production, expensive machinery, and razor-thin margins.

In order to remain economically viable, a mid-South farmer must produce a high quantity of crops and then sell that crop at an adequate price, which doesn't always work out so well. Some years in Arkansas a farmer might do very well if conditions are right and the prices don't drop too low, but in other years times can be absolutely brutal. This amendment takes the wrong approach because it adds even more uncertainty to the farmer's operation.

Most farmers go to the bank for loans to pay production costs and purchases of new technology and machinery. Once you introduce a restrictive AGI, it becomes much more difficult to obtain the financing necessary to sustain an operation and stay in business.

Through a careful approach, the Ag Committee has already brought significant reforms to AGI eligibility, which has already been difficult on some of my producers. We certainly don't need to go a step further.

Additionally, requiring active, on-farm labor is counterproductive for two reasons: one, it discourages farms from improving and becoming more efficient; and, two, it discourages the participation of young farmers, and that could mean that they're out of a job. Farm owners and operators need to focus their attention on the management of the overall farm and key management decisions.

I strongly urge defeat of this amendment, with all due respect.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for the time. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Farming in 2013 can be a very complicated, high-tech and high-risk business. For example, there are many farmers in my district who farm thousands of acres that they don't own. They might grow cotton, peanuts, grains and specialty crops. They need a whole fleet of different equipment for each one of these crops. They're probably irrigating a whole lot of their crops. They likely employ dozens of people. These might be multimillion-dollar enterprises, and yet they still fit in the definition of a family farm. For these kinds of crops, it simply takes that kind of scale to be sustainable. Many farmers simply cannot afford to farm on that scale unless they have a safety net that can cover their risk.

This bill includes sustainable reforms of our farm safety net to make sure it's available to the people who need it most. It's not fair, nor in our best interest, to limit the participation of these larger family farms by undercutting their safety net, as this amendment would do. We need these farmers and they need us.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

□ 1200

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield the balance of my time to the ranking member of the House Ag Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I rise in opposition to this amendment.

If you like the Department of Labor's overreach on child labor when they prevented 4-H kids from helping mom and dad on the farm, you're going to love this amendment. What this amendment does is it puts bureaucrats in charge of deciding who is a farmer and who isn't.

When we put this AGI test on, they developed 430 pages of regulations to try to figure out how to implement that. If this amendment passes, I would be hard-pressed to figure out how many pages of regulations they're going to come up with to try to figure out whether you're actually a farmer or not.

We're changing this "actively engaged" definition, which we've been struggling with for years, and which I think we did a pretty good job with in 2008, putting in new requirements, new tests, stuff that we really don't understand how it's going to work. I think it is just going to totally screw up the safety net, especially for our friends in the South that have a different situation than we do up in my part of the world.

This is an overreach. It's getting into areas that we've never done before with payment limitations at a time when we're changing these programs. We don't really even understand how this would work, other than to know it's going to really screw things up.

I would strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 101 printed in part B of House Report 113-117.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In subtitle A of title IV, strike section 4007 and insert the following:

SEC. 4007. ELIMINATING THE LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE LOOPHOLE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(11)(A), by striking "(other than" and all that follows through "et seq.)" and inserting "(other than payments or allowances made under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) or any payments under any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B)(1)))";

(2) in subsection (e)(6)(C), by striking clause (iv); and

(3) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (C);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (C) through (F), respectively; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (4).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2605(f) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8624(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "(1)"; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2).

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4033. PROJECTS TO PROMOTE WORK AND INCREASE STATE AGENCY ACCOUNTABILITY.

Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020), as amended by section 4015, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(w) PROJECTS TO PROMOTE WORK AND INCREASE STATE AGENCY ACCOUNTABILITY.—The State agency shall create a work activation program that operates as follows:

"(1) Each able-bodied individual participating in the program—

"(A) shall at the time of application for supplemental food and nutrition assistance and every 12 months thereafter, register for employment in a manner prescribed by the chief executive officer of the State;

"(B) shall, each month of participation in the program, participate in—

"(i) 2 days of supervised job search for 8 hours per day at the program site; and

"(ii) 5 days of off-site activity for 8 hours per day;

"(C) shall not refuse without good cause to accept an offer of employment, at a site or plant not subject to a strike or lockout at the time of the refusal, at a wage not less than the higher of—

"(i) the applicable Federal or State minimum wage; or

"(ii) 80 percent of the wage that would have governed had the minimum hourly rate under section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) been applicable to the offer of employment;

"(D) shall not refuse without good cause to provide a State agency with sufficient information to allow the State agency to determine the employment status or the job availability of the individual; and

"(E) shall not voluntarily—

"(i) quit a job; or

"(ii) reduce work effort and, after the reduction, the individual is working less than 30 hours per week, unless another adult in the same family unit increases employment at the same time by an amount equal to the reduction in work effort by the first adult.

“(2) An able-bodied individual participating in the work activation program who fails to comply with 1 or more of the requirements described in paragraph(1)—

“(A) shall be subject to a sanction period of not less than a 2-month period beginning the day of the individual’s first failure to comply with such requirements during which the individual shall not receive any supplemental food and nutrition assistance; and

“(B) may receive supplemental food and nutrition assistance after the individual is in compliance with such requirements for not less than a 1-month period beginning after the completion of such sanction period, except that such assistance may not be provided retroactively.”.

SEC. 4034. REPEAL OF CERTAIN AUTHORITY TO WAIVE WORK REQUIREMENT.

The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 6(o) by striking paragraph (4); and

(2) in section 16(b)(1)(E)(ii)—

(A) in subclause (II) by adding “and” at the end;’

(B) by striking subclause (III); and

(C) by redesignating subclause (IV) as subclause (III).

SEC. 4035. ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING.

(a) FUNDING OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.—Section 16 of Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025) is amended by striking subsection (h).

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE COST-SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 16(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(a)) is amended in the first sentence, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “(other than a program carried out under section 6(d)(4))” after “supplemental nutrition assistance program”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 17(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(hh) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(hh)) is amended by striking “(g), (h)(2), or (h)(3)” and inserting “or (g)”.

(B) Section 22(d)(1)(B)(ii) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2031(d)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking “, (g), (h)(2), and (h)(3)” and inserting “and (g)”.

(c) WORKFARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 20 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2029) is amended by striking subsection (g).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 17(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(jj) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(jj)) is amended by striking “or (g)(1)”.

SEC. 4036. ELIMINATING THE NUTRITION EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 28 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036a) is repealed.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today along with several of my colleagues to offer what we believe should be the first step in serious reform of a SNAP program, also known as food stamps.

It has been said we should judge the success of government programs not by the number of people receiving the ben-

efits but by the number of people who no longer need them.

As a result of the bipartisan work reforms in the TANF program in 1996, after that period we saw a 57 percent reduction in the number of people on TANF. This amendment would take the most successful welfare reform in the history of this country, signed into law by President Bill Clinton and passed by a Republican Congress, and apply it to now the largest means-tested assistance program we have. That’s what that amendment would do.

In addition to applying that successful work requirement, we would have additional reforms in terms of LIHEAP and a few other items that would provide additional savings in the food stamp program.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I speak in opposition to this amendment.

This is really a very poorly conceived amendment that would require all non-disabled individuals to participate in a job search every month or immediately lose benefits, even if the individual is already working or even if the individual is a child, a minor.

This amendment would increase the SNAP cuts by 50 percent to \$31 billion, instead of the \$21.5 billion. It would immediately subject 2 million jobless, childless adults to harsh benefit cuts. It would slash benefits for 2 million people about \$90 a month. It would eliminate all the SNAP employment and training funds, eliminate nutrition education, impose new job search requirements on all people, even if they’re working, and it would send people into a deep, deep depression.

I think that this is an amendment that we should oppose.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to a member of the Ag Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I rise in strong support of this amendment. In fact, part of the language of a bill that I had introduced is incorporated in this bill, and I appreciate the gentleman for including that.

What is this amendment about? It’s about making sure that people that are on these programs qualify for them. That they’re not automatically put on them because they’re on some other program. It’s also about reducing duplicative programs in the government, such as nutrition education and job training. We have job training in other programs.

But more importantly, what the American people understand is that our entitlement programs are growing

at an unsustainable rate, and so we need to make sure that people that are on food stamps are actively looking for work. I don’t think anybody argues with that.

The second thing is making sure that people that are on this program are the people that need it, and secondly, that qualify for it.

So this is a commonsense amendment and the American taxpayers deserve this kind of accountability. Anything less is unacceptable.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

This is yet another heartless cut on the backs of hungry families all across America. How much is enough for those who are relentless—relentless—in attacking low-income families and hungry children. Cutting over \$20 billion in SNAP benefits is bad enough, but this amendment would add insult to injury. This is mind-boggling.

Let me tell you, I know from personal experience, no one wants to be on food stamps. Many who are on SNAP are hardworking people making minimum wage, and others are desperately looking for a job in these difficult economic times.

This amendment demands that hungry families search for a job even while it eliminates all employment assistance and job-training funds for those very families. Let’s not pretend that by making a family suffer more hunger and more desperation and more hardship that a job will suddenly appear for them.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this very, very heartless, cruel, and inhumane amendment.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

We have worked this out between the chairman and myself and this is breaking the deal that we had. I would say a vote for this amendment is a vote against the farm bill, so oppose it.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the balance of the time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate waiting on a few other folks to speak.

One thing I would like to point out, I appreciate the arguments of my colleague from Texas that indicates these are commonsense reforms. I think most Americans agree, let’s help folks that are in need, but we probably shouldn’t help those who don’t actually

qualify for food stamps. With the adoption of this amendment, it will require folks that would like to receive food stamps—SNAP benefits—to actually have to qualify for them instead of being qualified through another program.

It was also noted about the impact of these reforms and their potential impact on cuts. Let's look at a little history of this particular program. In 2002, in the 2002 farm bill, \$270 billion was the spending level—\$270 billion. In the 2008 farm bill, it was approximately \$400 billion. If this amendment is adopted, the spending level would be \$733 billion. Only in Washington could you say going from \$270 billion to \$733 billion is a cut.

These are commonsense reforms. These a few decades ago were considered bipartisan reforms to encourage people to look for work, to encourage people to get a job.

I agree with my colleagues: there isn't a person in America I don't think that wouldn't rather have a paycheck rather than a SNAP check or a SNAP card, or a Vision card if you're in the State of Kansas.

□ 1210

These are very commonsense reforms. They will work. They are good for Americans. They are good for our taxpayers. They are good for the people receiving benefits. We have 47 million Americans receiving food stamps today. Please, let's ask them—require them—to actually go out and look for jobs. They might actually find them.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Colleagues, the process of crafting this farm bill has entailed much effort by the committee. We've looked at everything within our jurisdictions. We've come up with ways of saving money and reforming things and making things more efficient across the board in every title. Let me touch, for just a moment, on the nutrition title.

The committee agreed to \$20.5 billion in savings: ending categorical eligibility, compelling States to the tune of \$8 billion worth of savings to make adjustments in how they address LIHEAP. We have gone a tremendous distance in a bipartisan way to achieve the first real reform since 1996.

Now, I appreciate my colleagues' efforts to try and increase those savings, but I say to you that the number in the bill is workable, that it is something that we can achieve, that it is something through which I believe—and we don't all necessarily see eye to eye on this—we will still allow those folks who are qualified under Federal law to receive the help they need, that they deserve.

Please turn this amendment back. Please move forward with the reforms we have. Let's do things that we've not

been able to do since 1996. Let's not go so far that nothing is the end result. Defeat the amendment. Support the bill. Let us move forward.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. SOUTHERLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 102 printed in part B of House Report 113-117.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 336, line 8, strike "\$375,000,000" and insert "\$372,000,000".

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4033. PILOT PROJECTS TO PROMOTE WORK AND INCREASE STATE ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026), as amended by sections 4021 and 4022, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) PILOT PROJECTS TO PROMOTE WORK AND INCREASE STATE ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out pilot projects to develop and test methods allowing States to run a work program with certain features comparable to the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), with the intent of increasing employment and self-sufficiency through increased State accountability and thereby reducing the need for supplemental nutrition assistance benefits.

“(2) AGREEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall enter into cooperative agreements with States in accordance with pilot projects that meet the criteria required under this subsection.

“(B) APPLICATION.—To be eligible for a cooperative agreement under this paragraph, a State shall submit to the Secretary a plan that complies with requirements of this subsection beginning in fiscal year 2014. The Secretary may not disapprove applications which meet the requirements of this subsection as described through its amended supplemental nutrition assistance State Plan.

“(C) ASSURANCES.—A State shall include in its plan assurances that its pilot project will—

“(i) operate for at least three 12-month periods but not more than five 12-month periods;

“(ii) have a robust data collection system for program administration that is designed and shared with project evaluators to ensure proper and timely evaluation; and

“(iii) intend to offer a work activity described in paragraph (4) to adults assigned

and required to participate under paragraph (3)(A) and who are not exempt under paragraph (3)(F).

“(D) NUMBER OF PILOT PROJECTS.—Any State may carry out a pilot project that meets the requirements of this subsection.

“(E) EXTENT OF PILOT PROJECTS.—Pilot projects shall cover no less than the entire State.

“(F) OTHER PROGRAM WAIVERS.—Waivers for able-bodied adults without dependents provided under section 6(o) are void for States covered by a pilot project carried out under paragraph (1).

“(3) WORK ACTIVITY.—(A) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘work activity’ means any of the following:

“(i) Employment in the public or private sector that is not subsidized by any public program.

“(ii) Employment in the private sector for which the employer receives a subsidy from public funds to offset some or all of the wages and costs of employing an adult.

“(iii) Employment in the public sector for which the employer receives a subsidy from public funds to offset some or all of the wages and costs of employing an adult.

“(iv) A work activity that—

“(I) is performed in return for public benefits;

“(II) provides an adult with an opportunity to acquire the general skills, knowledge, and work habits necessary to obtain employment;

“(III) is designed to improve the employability of those who cannot find unsubsidized employment; and

“(IV) is supervised by an employer, work site sponsor, or other responsible party on an ongoing basis.

“(v) Training in the public or private sector that is given to a paid employee while he or she is engaged in productive work and that provides knowledge and skills essential to the full and adequate performance of the job.

“(vi) Job search, obtaining employment, or preparation to seek or obtain employment, including—

“(I) life skills training;

“(II) substance abuse treatment or mental health treatment, determined to be necessary and documented by a qualified medical, substance abuse, or mental health professional; or

“(III) rehabilitation activities; supervised by a public agency or other responsible party on an ongoing basis.

“(vii) Structured programs and embedded activities—

“(I) in which adults perform work for the direct benefit of the community under the auspices of public or nonprofit organizations;

“(II) that are limited to projects that serve useful community purposes in fields such as health, social service, environmental protection, education, urban and rural redevelopment, welfare, recreation, public facilities, public safety, and child care;

“(III) that are designed to improve the employability of adults not otherwise able to obtain unsubsidized employment; and

“(IV) that are supervised on an ongoing basis; and

“(V) with respect to which a State agency takes into account, to the extent possible, the prior training, experience, and skills of a recipient in making appropriate community service assignments.

“(viii) Career and technical training programs (not to exceed 12 months with respect to any adult) that are directly related to the preparation of adults for employment in current or emerging occupations and that are supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(ix) Training or education for job skills that are required by an employer to provide

an adult with the ability to obtain employment or to advance or adapt to the changing demands of the workplace and that are supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(x) Education that is related to a specific occupation, job, or job offer and that is supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(xi) In the case of an adult who has not completed secondary school or received such a certificate of general equivalence, regular attendance—

“(I) in accordance with the requirements of the secondary school or course of study, at a secondary school or in a course of study leading to such certificate; and

“(II) supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(xii) Providing child care to enable another recipient of public benefits to participate in a community service program that—

“(I) does not provide compensation for such community service;

“(II) is a structured program designed to improve the employability of adults who participate in such program; and

“(III) is supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(B) PROTECTIONS.—Work activities under this subsection shall be subject to all applicable health and safety standards. Except as described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A), the term ‘work activity’ shall be considered work preparation and not defined as employment for purposes of other law.

“(4) PILOT PROJECTS.—Pilot projects carried out under paragraph (1) shall include interventions to which adults are assigned that are designed to reduce unnecessary dependence, promote self sufficiency, increase work levels, increase earned income, and reduce supplemental nutrition assistance benefit expenditures among households eligible for, applying for, or participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

“(A) Adults assigned to interventions by the State shall—

“(i) be subject to mandatory participation in work activities specified in paragraph (4), except those with 1 or more dependent children under 1 year of age;

“(ii) participate in work activities specified in paragraph (4) for a minimum of 20 hours per week per household;

“(iii) be a maximum age of not less than 50 and not more than 60, as defined by the State;

“(iv) be subject to penalties during a period of nonparticipation without good cause ranging from, at State option, a minimum of the removal of the adults from the household benefit amount, up to a maximum of the discontinuance of the entire household benefit amount; and

“(v) not be penalized for nonparticipation if child care is not available for 1 or more children under 6 years of age.

“(B) The State shall allow certain individuals to be exempt from work requirements—

“(i) those participating in work programs under a State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) for an equal or greater number of hours;

“(ii) 1 adult family member per household who is needed in the home to care for a disabled family member;

“(iii) a parent who is a recipient of or becomes eligible for Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) or Supplemental Security Income (SSI); and

“(iv) those with a good cause reason for nonparticipation, such as victims of domestic violence, as defined by the State.

“(5) EVALUATION AND REPORTING.—

“(A) EVALUATION.—

“(i) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for each State that enters into an agreement under paragraph (2) an independent,

longitudinal evaluation of its pilot project under this subsection to determine total program savings over the entire course of the pilot project with results reported in consecutive 12-month increments.

“(II) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the evaluation is to measure the impact of interventions provided by the State under the pilot project on the ability of adults in households eligible for, applying for, or participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program to find and retain employment that leads to increased household income and reduced dependency.

“(III) REQUIREMENT.—The independent evaluation under subclause (I) shall use valid statistical methods which can determine the difference between supplemental nutrition assistance benefit expenditures, if any, as a result of the interventions as compared to a control group that—

“(aa) is not subject to the interventions provided by the State under the pilot project under this subsection; and

“(bb) maintains services provided under 16(h) in the year prior to the start of the pilot project under this subsection.

“(IV) OPTION.—States shall have the option to evaluate pilot projects by matched counties or matched geographical areas using a constructed control group design to isolate the effects of the intervention of the pilot project.

“(V) DEFINITION.—Constructed control group means there is no random assignment, and instead program participants (those subject to interventions) and non-participants (control) are equated using matching or statistical procedures on characteristics that may be associated with program outcomes.

“(B) REPORTING.—Not later than 90 days after the end of fiscal year 2014 and of each fiscal year thereafter, until the completion of the last evaluation under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, a report that includes a description of—

“(i) the status of each pilot project carried out under paragraph (1);

“(ii) the results of the evaluation completed during the previous fiscal year; and

“(iii) to the maximum extent practicable—

“(I) baseline information relevant to the stated goals and desired outcomes of the pilot project;

“(II) the impact of the interventions on appropriate employment, income, and public benefit receipt outcomes among households participating in the pilot project;

“(III) equivalent information about similar or identical measures among control or comparison groups;

“(IV) the planned dissemination of the report findings to State agencies; and

“(V) the steps and funding necessary to incorporate into State employment and training programs the components of pilot projects that demonstrate increased employment and earnings.

“(C) PUBLIC DISSEMINATION.—In addition to the reporting requirements under subparagraph (B), evaluation results shall be shared broadly to inform policy makers, service providers, other partners, and the public in order to promote wide use of successful strategies, including by posting evaluation results on the Internet website of the Department of Agriculture.

“(6) FUNDING.—

“(A) AVAILABLE FUNDS.—From amounts made available under section 18(a)(1), the Secretary shall make available—

“(i) up to \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017 for evaluations described in paragraph (5) to carry out this

subsection, with such amounts to remain available until expended; and

“(ii) amounts equal to one-half of the accumulated supplemental nutrition assistance benefit dollars saved over each consecutive 12-month period according to the evaluation under paragraph (5) for bonus grants to States under paragraph (7)(B).

“(B) LIMITATION.—A State operating a pilot project under this subsection shall not receive more funding under section 16(h) than the State received the year prior to commencing a project under this subsection and shall not claim funds under 16(a) for expenses that are unique to the pilot project under this subsection.

“(C) OTHER FUNDS.—Any additional funds required by a State to carry out a pilot project under this subsection may be provided by the State from funds made available to the State for such purpose and in accordance with State and other Federal laws, including the following:

“(i) Section 403 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603).

“(ii) The Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 9201 et seq.).

“(iii) The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.) and section 418 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 618).

“(iv) The social services block grant under subtitle A of title XX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397 et seq.).

“(7) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(A) SPECIFIC USES.—Funds provided under this subsection for evaluation of pilot projects shall be used only for—

“(i) pilot projects that comply with this subsection;

“(ii) the costs incurred in gathering and providing information and data used to conduct the independent evaluation under paragraph (5); and

“(iii) the costs of the evaluation under paragraph (5).

“(B) LIMITATION.—Funds provided for bonus grants to States for pilot projects under this subsection shall be used only for—

“(i) pilot projects that comply with this subsection;

“(ii) amounts equal to one-half of the accumulated supplemental nutrition assistance benefit dollars saved over each consecutive 12-month period according to the evaluation under paragraph (5); and

“(iii) any State purpose, not to be restricted to the supplemental nutrition assistance program or its beneficiary population.”.

SEC. 4034. IMPROVED WAGE VERIFICATION USING THE NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF NEW HIRES.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 11(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by inserting “and after compliance with the requirement specified in paragraph (24)” after “section 16(e) of this Act”;

(2) in paragraph (22) by striking “and” at the end,

(3) in paragraph (23) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”, and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(24) that the State agency shall request wage data directly from the National Directory of New Hires established under section 453(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653(i)) relevant to determining eligibility to receive supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits and determining the correct amount of such benefits.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, the numbers don't lie. America's welfare system is broken.

Food stamp benefits have tripled in the past decade. There are more Americans living in poverty today than when the war on poverty was launched a half century ago. Instead of incentivizing work, we are reinforcing the same government dependency and cyclical poverty that we all wish to eliminate. It is clear that an important variable has been missing from America's anti-poverty equation, and that is the element of work.

History has proven that work is the surest way to empower able-bodied Americans to advance from welfare to self-sufficiency. When a Republican-controlled Congress and a Democrat President joined together to pass welfare reform requiring work, the results were dramatic. Nationwide, welfare rolls dropped by 67 percent. In my home State of Florida, the number was higher—approximately 85 percent. Work participation by never-married single moms and household earnings skyrocketed. Child poverty rates plummeted. This true bipartisan success story is what my amendment is based upon.

My amendment empowers the States to require work for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, benefits. We apply the same sensible work preparation, job training, and community service activities that are at the heart of welfare reform. Our plan is endorsed by several States' Human Services Secretaries who approached us because they understand how important work can be for individuals truly in need.

The simple fact, Mr. Chairman, is that "work" works. We must have a system in place that provides a helping hand to the most vulnerable among us. By requiring work for able-bodied SNAP recipients, we can ensure that the resources get to those in need more effectively and efficiently.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting my amendment and in renewing the God-given opportunity for earned success in America.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Despite what we have heard from the author of this program, there is no work in this bill. This amendment would more appropriately be called "The State Bonuses for Terminating SNAP Benefits for People Who Want to Work but Can't Find a Job Because They're in a Recession," and it ends benefits for children, disabled people, yes, and even for disabled veterans.

I think the most egregious thing about this amendment is that there is no funding for worker training programs in this bill at all even though we are ordering people to do it, and there is a perverse incentive for States to end SNAP benefits for people because, suddenly, food stamps, or SNAP benefits, become fungible.

We just rejected an amendment in our last series of votes that would have allowed people to get toothpaste and toothbrushes with SNAP benefits; but what this amendment does is allow the States to pocket these sanctions and use them for whatever they want to—to balance the budget with it or to convert SNAP benefits into tax breaks for corporations or for wealthy people.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia, Majority Leader CANTOR, who represents a State in which, as a result of the 1996 work requirement, welfare rolls were reduced by over 84 percent.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment.

In 1996, the Congress came together in a bipartisan way to change the incentive structure in our basic cash welfare program that helps needy families. The results were nothing but a success. Within 5 years, welfare caseloads fell by more than 60 percent, and the economic prospects of many former welfare families were substantially improved. America saw increased earnings by low-income families and significant reductions in child poverty. The incentives were right, and even in the depths of the worst economic turmoil of a few years ago, the reforms were succeeding at moving families from dependency into work.

Those changes made in welfare reform resulted from a foundation laid before 1996 in which States experimented with different approaches to determine which ones were the most effective at increasing workforce participation and boosting earnings. Prior to enactment of welfare reform, States had been given waivers of the old law to become laboratories of innovation.

The amendment by Mr. SOUTHERLAND before us today builds on that successful approach and will give States the opportunity to test whether the same successful strategies that were used in cash welfare programs in the 1990s will help food stamp recipients gain and retain employment and boost their earnings today. Mr. SOUTHERLAND's amendment provides for a pilot program, which will allow States, if they choose, to apply the TANF work requirements to their able-bodied working age adult food stamp caseload.

□ 1220

States have come forward asking us for the ability to enter into these demonstration projects. But unless we

adopt the gentleman's amendment, these States won't be able to launch these demonstration projects.

This amendment is well crafted and takes into consideration the availability of child care for mothers with young children and hardship situations like families facing domestic violence.

The Southerland amendment also tells States that if they're successful at increasing work participation and families' earnings among the food stamp caseload, they will share in the savings that would otherwise end up in the hands of the Federal Government.

If enacted, this amendment will help reduce Federal expenditures, provide assistance to the States, and most importantly it will help struggling families who find themselves relying on public assistance to get back on their feet.

Right now, many American families are struggling, and the SNAP program is in place to help these families who find themselves in dire economic circumstances. While this program is an important part of our safety net, our overriding goal should be to help our citizens with the education and skills they need to get back on their feet so that they can provide for themselves and their families.

I'd like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) for his work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support his amendment.

Ms. MOORE. I would like to inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. Just because we keep saying that the 1996 welfare program was successful, doesn't make it so. Poverty has increased among women and children. A quarter of all children in this country are poor.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, the effect of which would be to increase hunger and hardship across America. We have experienced the most devastating recession since the Great Depression.

Unemployment is at 7.5 percent. One in seven people today is availing himself of food stamps because there is a need to. People are struggling in our economy today. They want to work. They cannot find a job. Everyone is experiencing that in their own communities.

This amendment would allow an unlimited number of States to require an adult to receive or even apply for food stamps to be working or in job training, or else they lose their food stamp benefits. Why would a State want to do this? Because the amendment also allows States to keep part of the savings from cutting people off the program, use the money for whatever purpose the State officials want, instead of feeding people with those dollars.

States can cut taxes for companies or even maybe support special interest subsidies. And as my colleagues said, there is no funding in this bill for the creation of jobs; and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they refuse to deal with the issue of job creation and there is no worker-training money in this bill. So there is no funding to do what they would like to do.

Let's take the crop insurance program, my friends. We just voted on an amendment that voted down reforming that program. We have 26 individuals in this Nation. We can't find out who they are. They get at least a million dollars in a subsidy. Do you think they're eating well? Three squares or better a day. You know what? They have no income threshold, no asset test, no cap. They don't even have to farm the land, and they don't have to follow conservation practices. Do you want to go and find out where we can save money here? Let's find out who these 26 people are or those people who are on the crop insurance program, and let's make sure that they are working otherwise we will cut their benefits.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this unbelievably misguided amendment.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), whose welfare rolls were reduced by over 55 percent due to the 1996 work requirement.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment.

My colleague was absolutely right, the unemployment rate is 7.5 percent. People do want to go back to work. This is what this bill does: it helps people go back to work. Currently, the government has 83 programs to help people.

I'm the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources. We just had a hearing last week with Sada Randolph. Sada Randolph testified before our committee that she was under a government program. All they did was provide benefits to her until she got under TANF. That's where she got the help to find a job. We need to help people find jobs, keep jobs, support their families and give them hope.

I support this bill wholeheartedly because it gives the American people who are out of work today hope.

Ms. MOORE. We reduced welfare rolls because we literally threw people off. We did not help them find sustainable jobs, which is why poverty has increased.

I yield 30 seconds to the ranking member of the committee, Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentlelady, and I strongly oppose this amendment.

This amendment breaks the deal that we had and is offensive in the way that it treats the unemployed in this country.

In short what this proposal does is it takes money from benefits and hands it

over to the States, and they can do with it what they want, as was said earlier in the debate, with no strings attached, no accountability.

This Republican Congress has been vocal in support of block grants, and I suppose that's why they're supporting this amendment. But I'd like to point out that it was block-granting that is the very reason that we got into the LIHEAP situation and the categorical eligibility situation that we're trying to attempt in this bill.

Vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), whose welfare rolls were reduced by over 85 percent in the 1996 work requirements.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding and stand in support of the amendment.

There's two very major points of this. Number one is that we cannot continue to deny able-bodied people the dignity of work. There seems to be a belief in the nanny state that there's something wrong with requiring able-bodied people to work. That's what this amendment does. It says to you that if you can work, you ought to be working so that other people who are unable to, they can get the needed assistance.

Number two, it gives States flexibility. I trust the people in Florida. I trust the people in Wisconsin. I trust the people in Georgia and Florida and all over the country to do what's best for their State. That's what we need in America today: less centralized, Washington bureaucratic planners and more State flexibility because what might work in your State might be different in mine, but this is a requirement for able-bodied people to get a job in order to receive public assistance benefits.

It's very common sense, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the last 30 seconds to our good friend and colleague, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady.

This amendment is not on the level. It uses a word that is important to all of us: work.

Of course people want to work, but there is no money for a work program. There is an obligation on the person who has no income, who has children, to somehow magically create their own work program. Any of the work programs have to have some support to get people to be able to move from poverty to work.

This is a political statement. It's not a work program.

How poor is poor? This is telling folks they're not poor enough. Grind them and their children down; 1-year-old children will lose food as a result of this.

Ms. MOORE. With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

□ 1230

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113-117 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 99 by Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia.

Amendment No. 49 by Mr. RADEL of Florida.

Amendment No. 50 by Mr. WALBERG of Michigan.

Amendment No. 98 by Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 100 by Mr. FORTENBERRY of Nebraska.

Amendment No. 101 by Mr. HUELSKAMP of Kansas.

Amendment No. 102 by Mr. SOUTHERLAND of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 291, noes 135, answered "present" 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

AYES—291

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Alexander | Bridenstine | Clay |
| Amash | Brooks (AL) | Clyburn |
| Amodei | Brooks (IN) | Coble |
| Bachmann | Broun (GA) | Coffman |
| Bachus | Brown (FL) | Cohen |
| Barber | Brownley (CA) | Cole |
| Barletta | Buchanan | Collins (GA) |
| Barr | Bucshon | Collins (NY) |
| Barton | Burgess | Conaway |
| Bass | Butterfield | Connolly |
| Beatty | Calvert | Conyers |
| Becerra | Campbell | Cook |
| Bentivolio | Cantor | Cotton |
| Bilirakis | Capito | Crawford |
| Bishop (GA) | Cárdenas | Crenshaw |
| Black | Carney | Cuellar |
| Blackburn | Carson (IN) | Culberson |
| Blumenauer | Cassidy | Daines |
| Boehner | Castor (FL) | Davis (CA) |
| Bonner | Castro (TX) | Davis, Danny |
| Boustany | Chabot | Davis, Rodney |
| Brady (PA) | Chaffetz | DeGette |
| Brady (TX) | Clarke | Denham |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Dent | Kinzinger (IL) | Roskam | Larson (CT) | Michael | Sanchez, Loretta | Burgess | Holding | Polis |
| DeSantis | Kirkpatrick | Ross | Loeb sack | Miller (MI) | Schrader | Calvert | Holt | Pompeo |
| DesJarlais | Kline | Rothfus | Lofgren | Miller, George | Serrano | Camp | Hudson | Posey |
| Deutch | LaMalfa | Royal-Allard | Long | Mullin | Sewell (AL) | Campbell | Huelskamp | Price (GA) |
| Diaz-Balart | Lamborn | Royce | Lowenthal | Nadler | Shea-Porter | Cantor | Huizenga (MI) | Radel |
| Dingell | Lance | Runyan | Lucas | Neal | Sherman | Carter | Hultgren | Rangel |
| Doggett | Lankford | Ruppersberger | Lujan Grisham | Negrete McLeod | Shimkus | Cassidy | Hunter | Reed |
| Doyle | Latham | Rush | (NM) | Nolan | Simpson | Castor (FL) | Hurt | Reichert |
| Duckworth | Latta | Ryan (WI) | Lujan, Ben Ray | Owens | Sinema | Chabot | Israel | Ribble |
| Duffy | Lee (CA) | Salmon | (NM) | Palazzo | Smith (MO) | Chaffetz | Issa | Rice (SC) |
| Duncan (SC) | Levin | Sanford | Lummis | Pastor (AZ) | Stewart | Clarke | Jenkins | Rigell |
| Duncan (TN) | Lewis | Sarbanes | Lynch | Pearce | Takano | Clay | Johnson (GA) | Roe (TN) |
| Ellmers | Lipinski | Scalise | Maffei | Pelosi | Thompson (CA) | Coble | Johnson (OH) | Rogers (MI) |
| Farenthold | LoBiondo | Schakowsky | Maloney, | Peters (MI) | Thompson (MS) | Coffman | Johnson, E. B. | Rohrabacher |
| Fattah | Lowey | Schiff | Carolyn | Peterson | Tierney | Cohen | Johnson, Sam | Rokita |
| Fitzpatrick | Luetkemeyer | Schneider | Maloney, Sean | Pingree (ME) | Tonko | Collins (GA) | Jones | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Fleischmann | Marchant | Schock | Matheson | Pocan | Tsongas | Collins (NY) | Jordan | Roskam |
| Flores | Marino | Schwartz | Matsui | Price (NC) | Valadao | Connolly | Kilmer | Ross |
| Forbes | Massie | Schweikert | McCollum | Rahall | Vargas | Cook | Kind | Rothfus |
| Fortenberry | McCarthy (CA) | Scott (VA) | McGovern | Reichert | Vela | Cooper | Kingston | Royce |
| Poster | McCaul | Scott, Austin | McIntyre | Rogers (AL) | Visclosky | Cotton | Kinzinger (IL) | Ruiz |
| Fox | McClintock | Scott, David | Ruiz | McMorris | Walz | Crenshaw | Kline | Runyan |
| Frankel (FL) | McDermott | Sensenbrenner | Rodgers | Ryan (OH) | Welch | Culberson | Labrador | Rush |
| Franks (AZ) | McHenry | Sessions | McNerney | Sánchez, Linda | Williams | Cummings | Lamborn | Ryan (OH) |
| Frelinghuysen | McKeon | Shuster | Meng | T. | | Delaney | Lance | Ryan (WI) |
| Gabbard | McKinley | Sires | | | | DeSantis | Lankford | Salmon |
| Garcia | Meadows | Smith (NE) | Nunes | | | DesJarlais | Latta | Sanford |
| Gardner | Meehan | Smith (NJ) | | | | Diaz-Balart | Lee (CA) | Scalise |
| Garrett | Meeks | Smith (TX) | | | | Doggett | Levin | Schneider |
| Gerlach | Messer | Smith (WA) | | | | Doyle | Lipinski | Schock |
| Gibbs | Mica | Southerland | | | | Duckworth | LoBiondo | Schwartz |
| Gibson | Miller (FL) | Speier | Hastings (FL) | Markey | Nunnelee | Duffy | Loftgren | Schweikert |
| Gingrey (GA) | Moore | Stivers | Honda | McCarthy (NY) | Slaughter | Duncan (SC) | Long | Scott (VA) |
| Gohmert | Moran | Stockman | Larsen (WA) | Miller, Gary | | Duncan (TN) | Luetkemeyer | Scott, David |
| Goodlatte | Mulvaney | Stutzman | | | | Edwards | Lynch | Sensenbrenner |
| Gowdy | Murphy (FL) | Swalwell (CA) | | | | Esty | Maffei | Sessions |
| Graves (GA) | Murphy (PA) | Terry | | | | Farenthold | Maloney, Sean | Shuster |
| Grayson | Napolitano | Thompson (PA) | | | | Fattah | Marchant | Smith (MO) |
| Green, Al | Neugebauer | Thornberry | | | | Fitzpatrick | Massie | Smith (NJ) |
| Green, Gene | Noem | Tiberi | | | | Fleischmann | McCaul | Smith (TX) |
| Griffin (AR) | Nugent | Tipton | | | | Fleming | McClintock | Smith (WA) |
| Griffith (VA) | O'Rourke | Titus | | | | Flores | McHenry | Southerland |
| Grijalva | Olson | Turner | | | | Forbes | McKinley | Speier |
| Grimm | Pallone | Upton | | | | Fox | McMorris | Stewart |
| Guthrie | Pascrell | Van Hollen | | | | Frankel (FL) | Rodgers | Stutzman |
| Gutiérrez | Paulsen | Veasey | | | | Franks (AZ) | Meadows | Terry |
| Hahn | Payne | Walberg | | | | Frelinghuysen | Meehan | Thornberry |
| Hanna | Perlmutter | Walden | | | | Fudge | Meeks | Tiberi |
| Heck (NV) | Perry | Walorski | | | | Gabbard | Messer | Tierney |
| Hensarling | Peters (CA) | Wasserman | | | | Garcia | Mica | Titus |
| Himes | Petri | Schultz | | | | Gardner | Miller (FL) | Upton |
| Holding | Pittenger | Waters | | | | Garrett | Miller (MI) | Van Hollen |
| Holt | Pitts | Watt | | | | Gingrey (GA) | Moore | Wagner |
| Horsford | Poe (TX) | Waxman | | | | Gohmert | Mulvaney | Walorski |
| Hudson | Polis | Weber (TX) | | | | Gosar | Murphy (FL) | Wasserman |
| Huelskamp | Pompeo | Webster (FL) | | | | Gowdy | Neal | Schultz |
| Huizenga (MI) | Posey | Wenstrup | | | | Granger | Negrete McLeod | Waters |
| Hultgren | Price (GA) | Westmoreland | | | | Graves (GA) | Neugebauer | Watt |
| Hunter | Quigley | Whitfield | | | | Graves (MO) | Nugent | Weber (TX) |
| Hurt | Radel | Wilson (FL) | | | | Grayson | Nunnelee | Webster (FL) |
| Issa | Rangel | Wilson (SC) | | | | Green, Al | O'Rourke | Wenstrup |
| Jackson Lee | Reed | Wittman | | | | Green, Gene | Olson | Westmoreland |
| Jeffries | Renacci | Wolf | | | | Griffin (AR) | Palazzo | Williams |
| Johnson (OH) | Ribble | Womack | | | | Guthrie | Pallone | Wilson (SC) |
| Johnson, E. B. | Rice (SC) | Woodall | | | | Hanna | Pascrell | Wittman |
| Johnson, Sam | Richmond | Yarmuth | | | | Harris | Paulsen | Womack |
| Jones | Rigell | Yoder | | | | Hartzler | Perry | Woodall |
| Jordan | Roby | Yoho | | | | Hastings (WA) | Peters (CA) | Yoder |
| Joyce | Roe (TN) | Young (AK) | | | | Heck (NV) | Petri | Yoho |
| Kelly (IL) | Rogers (KY) | Young (FL) | | | | Hensarling | Pittenger | Young (AK) |
| Kelly (PA) | Rogers (MI) | Young (IN) | | | | Herrera Beutler | Pitts | Young (FL) |
| Kind | Rohrabacher | | | | | Higgins | Poe (TX) | Young (IN) |
| King (IA) | Rokita | | | | | | | |
| King (NY) | Rooney | | | | | | | |
| Kingston | Ros-Lehtinen | | | | | | | |

NOES—135

Aderholt

Andrews

Barrow (GA)

Benishkek

Bera (CA)

Bishop (NY)

Bishop (UT)

Bonomaci

Braley (IA)

Bustos

Camp

Capps

Capuano

Carter

Cartwright

Chu

Ciicilline

Cleaver

Cooper

Cooper

Courtney

Cramer

Crowley

Cummings

DeFazio

Delaney

DeLauro

DelBene

Edwards

Ellison

Engel

Enyart

Eshoo

Esty

Farr

Fincher

Fleming

Fudge

Gallego

Garamendi

Gosar

Granger

Graves (MO)

Hall

Hanabusa

Harper

Harris

Hartzler

Hastings (WA)

Heck (WA)

Herrera Beutler

Higgins

Hinojosa

Hoyer

Huffman

Israel

Jenkins

Johnson (GA)

Kaptur

Keating

Kennedy

Kildee

Kilmer

Kuster

Labrador

Langevin

NOES—192

Aderholt

Alexander

Bachus

Barber

Barr

Bass

Becerra

Benishkek

Bishop (GA)

Bishop (NY)

Bishop (UT)

Bonomaci

Bonner

Boustany

Braley (IA)

Brooks (IN)

Brown (FL)

Brownley (CA)

Bustos

Butterfield

Capito

Capps

Capuano

Cardenas

Carney

Carson (IN)

Cartwright

Castro (TX)

Chu

Ciicilline

Cleaver

Clyburn

Cole

Conaway

Conyers

Costa

Courtney

Cramer

Crawford

Crowley

Cuellar

Daines

Davis (CA)

Davis, Danny

Davis, Rodney

DeFazio

DeGette

DeLauro

DeBene

Denham

Dent

Deutch

Dingell

Ellison

Ellmers

Engel

Enyart

Eshoo

Farr

Fincher

Fortenberry

Foster

Gallego

Garamendi

Gerlach

Gibbs

Gibson

Goodlatte

Griffith (VA)

Grijalva

Grimm

Gutiérrez

Hahn

Hall

Hanabusa

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Nunes

Hastings (FL)

Honda

Larsen (WA)

Markey

McCarthy (NY)

Miller, Gary

Nunnelee

Slaughter

NOT VOTING—8

□ 1254

Mr. HALL changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. SIRES, LaMALFA, WAX-MAN, LEWIS, GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE, Messrs. JONES, MEEKS, and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I support the Dairy Security Act language as it was included in the Committee-passed draft of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act. Inadvertently, I voted in support of Amendment No. 99, sponsored by Rep. GOODLATTE to H.R. 1947. My intention was to vote against the amendment and to support the dairy provisions in the underlying bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. RADEL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 192, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

AYES—235

Amash

Amodei

Andrews

Bachmann

Barletta

Barrow (GA)

Barton

Beatty

Bentivolio

Bera (CA)

Billirakis

Black

Blackburn

Blumenauer

Brady (PA)

Brady (TX)

Bridenstine

Brooks (AL)

Broun (GA)

Buchanan

Buchson

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Harper | McDermott | Schakowsky | Black | Heck (NV) | Reichert | Herrera Beutler | Maloney, | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Heck (WA) | McGovern | Schiff | Blackburn | Hensarling | Renacci | Higgins | Carolyn | Roybal-Allard |
| Himes | McIntyre | Schrader | Blumenauer | Himes | Ribble | Hinojosa | Marino | Ruppersberger |
| Hinojosa | McKeon | Scott, Austin | Boustany | Huelskamp | Rice (SC) | Holding | Matsui | Ryan (OH) |
| Horsford | McNerney | Serrano | Brady (TX) | Huizenga (MI) | Rigell | Holt | McDermott | Sánchez, Linda |
| Hoyer | Meng | Sewell (AL) | Bridenstine | Hultgren | Roe (TN) | Horsford | McGovern | T. |
| Huffman | Michaud | Shea-Porter | Brooks (AL) | Hunter | Rogers (MI) | Hoyer | McIntyre | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Jackson Lee | Miller, George | Sherman | Brooks (IN) | Hurt | Rohrabacher | Hudson | McNerney | Sarbanes |
| Jeffries | Moran | Shimkus | Broun (GA) | Issa | Rokita | Huffman | Meehan | Schakowsky |
| Joyce | Mullin | Simpson | Buchanan | Johnson (GA) | Roskam | Kaptur | Meeks | Schiff |
| Kaptur | Murphy (PA) | Sinema | Bucshon | Johnson (OH) | Ross | Keating | Meng | Schneider |
| Keating | Napoliitano | Sires | Burgess | Johnson, E. B. | Rothfus | Jeffries | Michaud | Schock |
| Kelly (IL) | Noem | Smith (NE) | Butterfield | Johnson, Sam | Royce | Jenkins | Miller, George | Schrader |
| Kelly (PA) | Nolan | Stivers | Calvert | Jones | Ruiz | Joyce | Moran | Schwartz |
| Kennedy | Nunes | Stockman | Camp | Jordan | Runyan | Kaptur | Murphy (FL) | Scott (VA) |
| Kildee | Owens | Swalwell (CA) | Campbell | Kelly (PA) | Rush | Keating | Nadler | Scott, Austin |
| King (IA) | Pastor (AZ) | Takano | Cantor | Kind | Ryan (WI) | Kelly (IL) | Napolitano | Scott, David |
| King (NY) | Payne | Thompson (CA) | Carter | King (IA) | Salmon | Kennedy | Neal | Serrano |
| Kirkpatrick | Pearce | Thompson (MS) | Cassidy | Kingston | Sanford | Kildee | Negrete McLeod | Sewell (AL) |
| Kuster | Pelosi | Thompson (PA) | Chabot | Kinzing (IL) | Scalise | King (NY) | Noem | Shea-Porter |
| LaMalfa | Perlmutter | | Chaffetz | Kline | Schweikert | Kirkpatrick | Nolan | Sherman |
| Langevin | Peters (MI) | | Coffman | Labrador | Sensenbrenner | Kuster | Nunnelee | Sinema |
| Larson (CT) | Peterson | | Cole | Lamborn | Sessions | LaMalfa | Owens | Sires |
| Latham | Pingree (ME) | | Collins (NY) | Latta | Shimkus | Lance | Pallone | Smith (WA) |
| Lewis | Turner | | Cook | Shuster | Shimkus | Langevin | Pascarell | Stivers |
| Loeb sack | Pocan | | Cotton | Simpson | Smith (MO) | Lankford | Pastor (AZ) | Swalwell (CA) |
| Lowenthal | Price (NC) | | Crawford | Long | Smith (NE) | Larson (CT) | Pelosi | Takano |
| Lowe | Quigley | | Cuellar | Lujan Grisham | Smith (NJ) | Latham | Perlmutter | Thompson (CA) |
| Lucas | Rahall | | Culberson | (NM) | Smith (TX) | Lee (CA) | Perry | Thompson (MS) |
| Lujan Grisham | Renacci | | Cummings | Maloney, Sean | Southerland | Levin | Peters (MI) | Tierney |
| (NM) | Richmond | | Daines | Marchant | Speier | Lewis | Peterson | Tsongas |
| Luján, Ben Ray | Roby | | Davis, Rodney | Matheson | Stewart | Lipinski | Petri | Vargas |
| (NM) | Rogers (AL) | | DeFazio | McCarthy (CA) | Stewart | LoBiondo | Pingree (ME) | Veasey |
| Lummis | Rogers (KY) | | Delaney | McClintock | Stockman | Loeb sack | Pocan | Velázquez |
| Maloney, | Rooney | | DeSantis | McCollum | Stutzman | Lowenthal | Poe (TX) | Visclosky |
| Carolyn | Roybal-Allard | | DesJarlais | McHenry | Terry | Lowe | Price (NC) | Walz |
| Marino | Ruppersberger | | Deutch | McKeon | Thompson (PA) | Lucas | Quigley | Waxman |
| Matheson | Sánchez, Linda | | Doggett | McKinley | Thornberry | Luetkemeyer | Rahall | Welch |
| Matsui | T. | | Duckworth | McMorris | Tiberi | Luján, Ben Ray | Rangel | Whitfield |
| McCarthy (CA) | Sanchez, Loretta | | Duffy | Rodgers | Tipton | (NM) | Richmond | Wilson (FL) |
| McCollum | Sarbanes | | Duncan (SC) | Meadows | Titus | Lummis | Roby | Wilson (SC) |
| | | | Duncan (TN) | Messer | Tonko | Lynch | Rogers (AL) | Yarmuth |
| | | | Ellmers | Mica | Turner | Maffei | Rogers (KY) | Yoho |
| | | | Fincher | Miller (FL) | Upton | | Rooney | |
| | | | Fleischmann | Miller (MI) | Valadao | | | |
| | | | Fleming | Moore | Van Hollen | | | |
| | | | Flores | Mullin | Vela | | | |
| | | | Fortenberry | Mulvaney | Wagner | | | |
| | | | Fox | Murphy (PA) | Walberg | | | |
| | | | Frelinghuysen | Neugebauer | Walden | | | |
| | | | Gabbard | Nugent | Walorski | | | |
| | | | Gardner | Nunes | Wasserman | | | |
| | | | Garrett | O'Rourke | Schultz | | | |
| | | | Gibbs | Olson | Waters | | | |
| | | | Gingrey (GA) | Palazzo | Watt | | | |
| | | | Gohmert | Paulsen | Weber (TX) | | | |
| | | | Goodlatte | Payne | Webster (FL) | | | |
| | | | Gosar | Pearce | Wenstrup | | | |
| | | | Gowdy | Peters (CA) | Westmoreland | | | |
| | | | Graves (GA) | Pittenger | Williams | | | |
| | | | Graves (MO) | Pitts | Wittman | | | |
| | | | Grayson | Polis | Wolf | | | |
| | | | Green, Al | Pompeo | Womack | | | |
| | | | Griffin (AR) | Posey | Woodall | | | |
| | | | Hanabusa | Price (GA) | Yoder | | | |
| | | | Hanna | Radel | Young (AK) | | | |
| | | | Harris | Reed | Young (FL) | | | |
| | | | Hastings (WA) | | Young (IN) | | | |

NOT VOTING—7

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|-----------|
| Hastings (FL) | Markey | Slaughter |
| Honda | McCarthy (NY) | |
| Larsen (WA) | Miller, Gary | |

□ 1303

Messrs. CASSIDY, JOHNSON of Georgia, MEEKS, Ms. LEE of California, Messrs. RANGEL and DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. AL GREEN of Texas and NUNNELEE changed their vote from “no” to aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 211, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—215

| | | |
|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Alexander | Bachmann | Barton |
| Amash | Barletta | Benishak |
| Amodei | Barr | Bentivolio |
| Andrews | Barrow (GA) | Bilirakis |

NOES—211

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| Aderholt | Clarke | Engel |
| Bachus | Clay | Enyart |
| Barber | Cleaver | Eshoo |
| Bass | Clyburn | Esty |
| Beatty | Coble | Farenthold |
| Becerra | Cohen | Farr |
| Bera (CA) | Collins (GA) | Fattah |
| Bishop (GA) | Conaway | Fitzpatrick |
| Bishop (NY) | Cannolly | Forbes |
| Bishop (UT) | Conyers | Foster |
| Bonamici | Cooper | Frankel (FL) |
| Bonner | Cramer | Fudge |
| Brady (PA) | Crenshaw | Galleo |
| Braley (IA) | Crowley | Garamendi |
| Brown (FL) | Davis (CA) | Garcia |
| Brownley (CA) | Davis, Danny | Gerlach |
| Bustos | DeGette | Granger |
| Capito | DeLauro | Green, Gene |
| Capps | DelBene | Griffith (VA) |
| Capuano | Denham | Grijalva |
| Cárdenas | Dent | Grimm |
| Carney | Diaz-Balart | Guthrie |
| Carson (IN) | Dingell | Gutiérrez |
| Cartwright | Doyle | Hahn |
| Castor (FL) | Edwards | Hall |
| Castro (TX) | Ellison | Harper |
| Chu | | Hartzler |
| Cicilline | | Heck (WA) |

NOT VOTING—8

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Franks (AZ) | Larsen (WA) | Miller, Gary |
| Hastings (FL) | Markey | Slaughter |
| Honda | McCarthy (NY) | |

□ 1307

Mr. POLIS and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

Mr. CONNOLLY changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. PITTS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 221, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—206

| | | |
|----------|-------------|-------------|
| Amash | Bentivolio | Brooks (IN) |
| Amodei | Bishop (UT) | Broun (GA) |
| Andrews | Black | Bucshon |
| Andrews | Blackburn | Burgess |
| Barletta | Blumenauer | Campbell |
| Barr | Brady (PA) | Cantor |
| Barton | Brady (TX) | Capito |
| Beatty | Bridenstine | Carney |

Cartwright Johnson (GA)
 Chabot Johnson (OH)
 Chaffetz Jordan
 Cicilline Joyce
 Clay Kelly (IL)
 Coffman Kelly (PA)
 Collins (GA) Kilmer
 Collins (NY) Kind
 Cook King (IA)
 Cooper King (NY)
 Cotton Kingston
 Davis, Danny Kuster
 Delaney Lance
 Dent Langevin
 DeSantis Lankford
 DesJarlais Latta
 Doggett Lee (CA)
 Duncan (SC) Lipinski
 Duncan (TN) LoBiondo
 Esty Long
 Fattah Lowey
 Fitzpatrick Marino
 Fleischmann Massie
 Flores Matheson
 Forbes McCaul
 Foster McClintock
 Foxx McHenry
 Franks (AZ) McKinley
 Frelinghuysen McNeerney
 Fudge Meadows
 Garamendi Meehan
 Garrett Meeks
 Gerlach Messer
 Gingrey (GA) Miller (FL)
 Gohmert Moore
 Goodlatte Moran
 Gosar Mulvaney
 Gowdy Murphy (PA)
 Graves (GA) Neugebauer
 Griffin (AR) O'Rourke
 Griffith (VA) Olson
 Guthrie Pallone
 Gutiérrez Pascarell
 Hanna Payne
 Harris Perry
 Heck (NV) Peters (CA)
 Heck (WA) Petri
 Hensarling Pittenger
 Herrera Beutler Pitts
 Higgins Polis
 Himes Pompeo
 Holding Price (GA)
 Holt Quigley
 Horsford Reichert
 Huelskamp Renacci
 Hultgren Ribble
 Hurt Rice (SC)
 Israel Rigell
 Issa Roe (TN)
 Jeffries Rogers (MI)
 Jenkins Rohrabacher

NOES—221

Aderholt Coble
 Alexander Cohen
 Bachus Cole
 Barber Conaway
 Barrow (GA) Connolly
 Bass Conyers
 Becerra Costa
 Benishek Courtney
 Bera (CA) Cramer
 Bilirakis Crawford
 Bishop (GA) Crenshaw
 Bishop (NY) Crowley
 Bonamici Cuellar
 Bonner Culberson
 Boustany Cummings
 Braley (IA) Daines
 Brooks (AL) Davis (CA)
 Brown (FL) Davis, Rodney
 Brownley (CA) DeFazio
 Buchanan DeGette
 Bustos DeLauro
 Butterfield DelBene
 Calvert Denham
 Camp Deutch
 Capps Diaz-Balart
 Capuano Dingell
 Cardenas Doyle
 Carson (IN) Duckworth
 Carter Duffy
 Cassidy Edwards
 Castor (FL) Ellison
 Castro (TX) Ellmers
 Chu Engel
 Clarke Enyart
 Cleaver Eshoo
 Clyburn Farenthold

Rokita
 Rothfus
 Royce
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (WI) Salmon
 Salmon Sanford
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schock
 Schwartz
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shea-Porter
 Shuster
 Sinema
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiberi
 Moran
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Veasey
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walorski
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

Farr
 Fincher
 Fleming
 Fortenberry
 Frankel (FL)
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garcia
 Gardner
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Granger
 Graves (MO)
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Hahn
 Hall
 Hanabusa
 Harper
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Hinojosa
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huffman
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hunter
 Jackson Lee
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Keating

Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Levin
 Lewis
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Matsui
 McKeon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meng
 Mica
 Michaud
 Hastings (FL)
 Honda
 Larsen (WA)

NOT VOTING—7

Markey
 McCarthy (NY)
 Miller, Gary

□ 1311

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR.
FORTENBERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FOR-
 TENBERRY) on which further pro-
 ceedings were postponed and on which
 the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 230, noes 194,
 not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—230

Amash
 Andrews
 Barton
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Bridenstine
 Broun (GA)
 Brownley (CA)
 Burgess
 Cantor
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardenas
 Carney
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Clay

Ruiz
 Runyan
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schrader
 Scott, Austin
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Southerland
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Tipton
 Valadao
 Vargas
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Walden
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Whitfield
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth
 Yoho
 Young (AK)

Slaughter

Markey
 McCarthy (NY)
 Miller, Gary
 Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barber
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barrow (GA)
 Benishek
 Bera (CA)
 Bishop (GA)
 Black
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Brown (FL)
 Buchanan
 Buchson
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Capito
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Castro (TX)
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Cole

Kuster
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Matheson
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McNeerney
 Meadows
 Meeks
 Meng
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Moore
 Moran
 Mulvaney
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nunes
 O'Rourke
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Polis
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Radel
 Rangel
 Reichert
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Roskam
 Rothfus
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ruppersberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schwartz
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stewart
 Stockman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Terry
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Visclosky
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Westmoreland
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Yarmuth
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOES—194

Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Costa
 Cotton
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Duckworth
 Ellmers
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fleming
 Forbes
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia
 Gardner
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Granger
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Gutiérrez
 Hall
 Hanabusa
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Herrera Beutler
 Hinojosa
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Hultgren
 Hurt
 Jackson Lee
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Joyce
 Kelly (IL)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 LaMalfa
 Latham
 Latta
 Long
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Maffei

Maloney, Carolyn
 Marino
 Massie
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meehan
 Messer
 Miller (MI)
 Mullin
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Negrete McLeod
 Neugebauer
 Nugent
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pearce
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peterson
 Poe (TX)

Pompeo
 Rahall
 Reed
 Renacci
 Richmond
 Roby
 Rogers (AL)
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Ruiz
 Rush
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Schock
 Schrader
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Takano

Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Vargus
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Cramer
 Gabbard
 Hastings (FL)
 Honda

Larsen (WA)
 Markey
 McCarthy (NY)
 Miller, Gary

Miller, George
 Slaughter

□ 1314

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 250, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

AYES—175

Aderholt
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Buohon
 Burgess
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Cassidy

Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman
 Collins (GA)
 Cook
 Cotton
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes

Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Holding
 Hudson

Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 King (IA)
 Kingston
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Latta
 Long
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meadows
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)

Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Neugebauer
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Perry
 Petri
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Radel
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford

Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thornberry
 Tipton
 Upton
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Weber (TX)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOES—250

Alexander
 Andrews
 Bachus
 Barber
 Barrow (GA)
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Benishek
 Bera (CA)
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Cole
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 Deutch

Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fitzpatrick
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia
 Gerlach
 Gibson
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hanna
 Harper
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holt
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildeer
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Kuster

Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loebach
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McNerney
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Noem
 Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Polis

Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Richmond
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (MI)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Runyan
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider

Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stivers
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Titus

NOT VOTING—9

Gutiérrez
 Hastings (FL)
 Honda

Larsen (WA)
 Markey
 McCarthy (NY)

Miller, Gary
 Sewell (AL)
 Slaughter

□ 1317

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Chair, I was inadvertently absent and would like to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 270, "nay" on rollcall vote 274, and "nay" on rollcall vote 283.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. SOUTHERLAND

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 198, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

AYES—227

Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Buohon
 Burgess

Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cooper
 Cotton
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham

Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte

Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)

NOES—198

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummins
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch

Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)

Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Mica
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger

Carson (IN)
Hastings (FL)
Honda

Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Swellwell (CA)
Takano

NOT VOTING—9

Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)

□ 1320

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 284 the vote was gavelled down before I could record my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chair, had I been present for the following votes, I would have voted accordingly: roll No. 264 on agreeing to the amendment Brooks of Alabama Part B Amendment No. 18—“no” vote; roll No. 265 on agreeing to the amendment Butterfield of North Carolina Part B Amendment No. 25—“yes” Vote; roll No. 266 on agreeing to the amendment Marino of Pennsylvania Part B Amendment No. 26—“no” Vote; roll No. 267 on agreeing to the amendment Schweikert of Arizona Part B Amendment No. 30—“no” Vote; roll No. 268 on agreeing to the amendment Tierney of Massachusetts Part B Amendment No. 32—“yes” Vote; 1,6. Roll No. 269 on agreeing to the amendment Polis of Colorado Part B Amendment No. 37—“yes” Vote; roll No. 270 on agreeing to the amendment Garamendi of California Part B Amendment No. 38—“yes” Vote; roll No. 271 on agreeing to the amendment Marino of Pennsylvania Part B Amendment No. 41—“no” Vote; roll No. 272 on agreeing to the amendment McClintock of California Part B Amendment No. 43—“no” Vote; roll No. 273 on agreeing to the amendment Gibson/Meeks/Sean Maloney of New York Part B Amendment No. 44—“yes” Vote; roll No. 274 on agreeing to the amendment Walorski of Indiana Part B Amendment No. 45—“no” Vote; roll No. 275 on agreeing to the amendment Courtney of Connecticut Part B Amendment No. 46—“yes” Vote; roll No. 276 on agreeing to the amendment Kind of Wisconsin Part B Amendment No. 47—“no” Vote; roll No. 277 on agreeing to the amendment Carney/Radel of Delaware Part B Amendment No. 48—“no” Vote; roll No. 278 on agreeing to the amendment Goodlatte/Scott (GA)/Moran/Polis/Meeks/ DeGette/Lee of Virginia Part B Amendment No. 99—“yes” Vote; roll No. 279 on agreeing to the amendment Radel of Florida Part B Amendment No. 49—“no” Vote; roll No. 280 on agreeing to the amendment Walberg of Michigan Part B Amendment No. 50—“yes” Vote; roll No. 281 on agreeing to the amendment

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Pitts/Davis (IL) of Pennsylvania Part B Amendment No. 98—“no” Vote; roll No. 282 on agreeing to the amendment Fortenberry of Nebraska Part B Amendment No. 100—“no” Vote; roll No. 283 on agreeing to the amendment Huelskamp of Kansas Part B Amendment No. 101—“no” Vote; roll No. 284 on agreeing to the amendment Southernland of Florida Part B Amendment No. 102—“no” Vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 271, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 496, after line 14, add the following:

SEC. 8408. PROTECTING HOMEOWNERS FROM THE DEVASTATING EFFECTS OF WILDFIRES IN THE WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE.

The Act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11) is amended by adding at the end of the second full paragraph at 30 Stat. 35 (16 U.S.C. 551) the following new sentence: “To ensure there are sufficient funds to provide the most modern equipment available for wildfire suppression and to ensure there are adequate numbers of personnel to manage and suppress wildfires, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture such sums as may be necessary for fire suppression equipment and personnel to conduct forest fire suppression activities on National Forest System lands and emergency fire suppression on or adjacent to such lands or

other lands regarding which the Secretary has entered into a fire protection agreement.”.

Page 379, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 380, line 8.

Page 384, strike lines 3 through 9.

Page 391, strike lines 19 through 24 and insert the following:

SEC. _____. **CREATING JOBS AND SMALL BUSINESSES IN RURAL AMERICA, AND PROTECTING SAFE DRINKING WATER.**

(a) **WATER, WASTE DISPOSAL, AND WASTE-WATER FACILITY GRANTS.**—Section 306(a)(2)(B)(vii) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(2)(B)(vii)) is amended by striking “\$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012” and inserting “\$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018”.

(b) **RURAL BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY GRANTS.**—Section 306(a)(11)(D) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(11)(D)) is amended by striking “\$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012” and inserting “\$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018”.

(c) **EMERGENCY AND IMMINENT COMMUNITY WATER ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.**—Section 306A(i)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1926a(i)(2)) is amended by striking “2008 through 2012” and inserting “fiscal years 2014 through 2018”.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the dispensing of the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. LUCAS (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 1947. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment is a straightforward improvement that I believe both sides can agree is absolutely necessary.

First, the amendment would protect homes and businesses nationwide from devastating fires by funding wildfire suppression, personnel and firefighting equipment. Second, the amendment will help create jobs and small businesses throughout rural America and will provide safe drinking water to these communities as well.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly represent Ventura County in California. In May, we had a dangerous wildfire that burned over 24,000 acres. It threatened homes in Camarillo, surrounded Cal State University at Channel Islands, and burned parts of Naval Base Ventura County.

As the Springs Fire raged, we looked for help from the brave men and

women serving as firefighters, not only from my district, but throughout California and the Western States. Due to their tireless efforts, homes and businesses were saved, and not one life was lost.

Following the Springs Fire, I had the opportunity and occasion to thank the firefighters in my county.

They showed me the real time computer equipment they used to successfully fight this fire. With this equipment, firefighters could predict the direction of the fire and the terrain they would face next in real time. They asked that Congress make this life-saving communications equipment available to firefighters across this great Nation.

This is precisely the type of equipment my amendment would help provide along with aerial tankers and other firefighting aircraft.

So many Americans rely on the selfless help of firefighters across the Nation, most recently and courageously in fighting the recent fires in Colorado that have caused so much damage and loss of precious lives.

□ 1330

Our firefighters put their lives on the line, and we owe it to them and to our communities to provide adequate resources for fire suppression, personnel and state-of-the-art equipment.

My amendment would also support three critical rural development programs: water, waste disposal and wastewater facility grants; emergency and imminent water assistance grants; and rural business opportunity grants.

These grants help to provide critical water supplies to rural areas experiencing drought or other disasters. They also promote sustainable economic development, create jobs and build stronger communities.

Not only would these programs help in Ventura County, which was recently declared a rural disaster area by USDA, they would help in districts across the Nation suffering from similar and tragic hardships.

I came to Congress not to engage in partisan bickering but to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to solve the many critical challenges facing our Nation. Partnering with the States and our local communities during natural disasters and with communities that lack critical resources in difficult economic times is both a moral and economic imperative of this body.

It is with this in mind that I ask my colleagues to support this important amendment to help fight wildfires and to support our communities when they need it most.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I will not dwell on the points made by the good

lady, but I would like to take this time to discuss for just a moment the process that we've gone through here and the nature of what we are trying to do in crafting another 5-year comprehensive farm bill.

We have gone through the most amazing open process in the House Agriculture Committee 2 years in a row, and we achieved consensus.

The bill this year might not be quite the same as the bill last year, and we have gone through, I think, an open process here on the floor where 103 or 104 amendments were considered by this body in open debate and open discussion and recorded votes in once again trying to achieve a consensus.

I know that not everyone has in this final bill exactly what they want. I know some of my very conservative friends think that it doesn't go far enough in the name of reform. I know some of my liberal friends think it goes too far in the name of addressing the needs of people.

But I would say to all of you that ultimately this body has to do its work. Ultimately, we have to move a product that we can go to conference with. Ultimately, we have to work out a consensus with the United States Senate so that we will have a final document that we can all consider together that hopefully the President will sign into law.

Now, I have tried in good faith, working with my ranking member and each and every one of you in every facet of these issues, to achieve that consensus. I have tried, and I hope that you recognize and acknowledge that.

We're at this critical moment. Whether you believe the bill has too much reform or not enough, or you believe it cuts too much or it doesn't cut enough, we have to move this document forward to achieve a common goal, to meet the needs of our citizens. No matter what part of the country, no matter whether they produce the food or consume the food, we have to meet those common needs in a responsible fashion.

I plead to you, I implore you to put aside whatever the latest email is or the latest flyer is or whatever comment or rumor you've heard from people near you or around you. Assess the situation. Look at the bill. Vote with me to move this forward. If you care about the consumers, the producers, the citizens of this country, move this bill forward. If it fails today, I can't guarantee you that you will see in this session of Congress another attempt, but I would assure each and every one of you, whether it's the appropriations process or amendments to other bills, the struggles will go on, but it won't be done in a balanced way.

If you care about your folks, if you care about this institution, if you care about utilizing open order, vote with us, vote with me on final. If you don't, when you leave here they'll just say it's a dysfunctional body, a broken institution full of dysfunctional people.

That's not true. You know that's not true.

Cast your vote in a responsible fashion. That's all I can ask.

Thank you, my friends. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 232, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

AYES—188

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Andrews | Fudge | McDermott |
| Barber | Gabbard | McGovern |
| Barrow (GA) | Gallego | McIntyre |
| Bass | Garamendi | McNerney |
| Beatty | Garcia | Meeks |
| Becerra | Grayson | Meng |
| Bera (CA) | Green, Al | Michaud |
| Bishop (GA) | Green, Gene | Moore |
| Bishop (NY) | Grijalva | Moran |
| Blumenauer | Gutiérrez | Murphy (FL) |
| Bonamici | Hahn | Nadler |
| Brady (PA) | Hanabusa | Napolitano |
| Braley (IA) | Hastings (FL) | Neal |
| Brownley (CA) | Heck (WA) | Negrete McLeod |
| Bustos | Higgins | Nolan |
| Butterfield | Himes | O'Rourke |
| Capps | Holt | Owens |
| Capuano | Horsford | Pallone |
| Cárdenas | Hoyer | Pascarell |
| Carney | Huffman | Pastor (AZ) |
| Carson (IN) | Israel | Payne |
| Carterwright | Jackson Lee | Perlmutter |
| Castor (FL) | Jeffries | Peters (CA) |
| Castro (TX) | Johnson (GA) | Peters (MI) |
| Chu | Johnson, E. B. | Peterson |
| Ciilline | Jones | Pingree (ME) |
| Clarke | Kaptur | Pocan |
| Clay | Keating | Polis |
| Cleaver | Kelly (IL) | Price (NC) |
| Clyburn | Kennedy | Quigley |
| Connolly | Kildee | Rahall |
| Conyers | Kilmer | Rangel |
| Costa | Kind | Richmond |
| Crowley | Kirkpatrick | Roybal-Allard |
| Cuellar | Kuster | Ruiz |
| Cummings | Langevin | Ruppersberger |
| Davis, Danny | Larson (CT) | Rush |
| DeFazio | Lee (CA) | Ryan (OH) |
| DeGette | Levin | Sánchez, Linda T. |
| Delaney | Lewis | Sanchez, Loretta |
| DeLauro | Lipinski | Sarbanes |
| DelBene | Loebach | Schakowsky |
| Deutch | Lofgren | Schiff |
| Dingell | Lowenthal | Schneider |
| Doggett | Lowey | Schrader |
| Doyle | Lujan Grisham | Schwartz |
| Duckworth | (NM) | Scott (VA) |
| Edwards | Lujan, Ben Ray | Scott, David |
| Ellison | (NM) | Serrano |
| Engel | Lynch | Sewell (AL) |
| Enyart | Maffei | Shea-Porter |
| Eshoo | Maloney | Sherman |
| Esty | Carolyn | Sinema |
| Farr | Maloney, Sean | Sires |
| Fattah | Matheson | Smith (WA) |
| Foster | Matsui | Speier |
| Frankel (FL) | McCollum | |

Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen

Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—232

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Pearce
Goodlatte
Gosar

Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 285, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 234, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

AYES—195

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Aderholt | Gibbs | Palazzo |
| Alexander | Gibson | Paulsen |
| Amodei | Gosar | Pearce |
| Bachus | Granger | Peters (MI) |
| Barber | Graves (MO) | Peterson |
| Barletta | Griffin (AR) | Petri |
| Barr | Griffith (VA) | Poe (TX) |
| Bartow (GA) | Grimm | Rahall |
| Barton | Guthrie | Reed |
| Benishek | Hall | Reichert |
| Bentivolio | Hanna | Renacci |
| Bera (CA) | Harper | Ribble |
| Bishop (UT) | Harris | Rice (SC) |
| Black | Hartzler | Roby |
| Blackburn | Hastings (WA) | Roe (TN) |
| Boehner | Herrera Beutler | Rogers (AL) |
| Bonner | Holding | Rogers (KY) |
| Boustany | Hudson | Rogers (MI) |
| Braley (IA) | Huizenga (MI) | Rokita |
| Brooks (AL) | Hultgren | Rooney |
| Brooks (IN) | Hunter | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Brownley (CA) | Issa | Roskam |
| Buchanan | Jenkins | Ross |
| Bucshon | Johnson (OH) | Runyan |
| Burgess | Johnson, Sam | Schock |
| Bustos | Joyce | Schrader |
| Calvert | Kelly (PA) | Scott, Austin |
| Camp | King (IA) | Sessions |
| Campbell | King (NY) | Shimkus |
| Cantor | Kinzing (IL) | Simpson |
| Capito | Kline | Sinema |
| Carter | LaMalfa | Smith (MO) |
| Cassidy | Lankford | Smith (NE) |
| Chaffetz | Latham | Smith (TX) |
| Coble | Latta | Southerland |
| Cole | Loebach | Stewart |
| Collins (NY) | Long | Stivers |
| Conaway | Lucas | Terry |
| Costa | Luetkemeyer | Thompson (PA) |
| Cramer | Lummis | Thornberry |
| Crawford | Marchant | Tiberi |
| Crenshaw | Marino | Tipton |
| Cuellar | McCarthy (CA) | Turner |
| Daines | McCauley | Upton |
| Davis, Rodney | McHenry | Valadao |
| Denham | McIntyre | Vela |
| Dent | McKeon | Wagner |
| DesJarlais | McKinley | Walberg |
| Diaz-Balart | McMorris | Walden |
| Duffy | Rodgers | Walorski |
| Ellmers | McNerney | Weber (TX) |
| Enyart | Meadows | Webster (FL) |
| Farenthold | Messer | Westmoreland |
| Farr | Mica | Whitfield |
| Fincher | Miller (MI) | Williams |
| Fitzpatrick | Mullin | Wilson (SC) |
| Fleischmann | Murphy (FL) | Wittman |
| Flores | Murphy (PA) | Womack |
| Forbes | Neugebauer | Woodall |
| Fortenberry | Noem | Yoder |
| Fox | Nugent | Yoho |
| Foxx | Nunes | Young (AK) |
| Frelinghuysen | Nunnelee | Young (FL) |
| Garcia | Olson | Young (IN) |
| Gardner | Owens | |
| Gerlach | | |

NOES—234

| | | |
|---------|----------|---------|
| Amash | Bachmann | Beatty |
| Andrews | Bass | Becerra |

NOT VOTING—14

| | | |
|------------|---------------|----------------|
| Brown (FL) | Honda | Miller, George |
| Cohen | Larsen (WA) | Pelosi |
| Courtney | Markey | Slaughter |
| Davis (CA) | McCarthy (NY) | Tierney |
| Hinojosa | Miller, Gary | |

□ 1341

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Bilirakis | Hanabusa | Pelosi |
| Bishop (GA) | Hastings (FL) | Perlmutter |
| Bishop (NY) | Heck (NV) | Perry |
| Blumenauer | Heck (WA) | Peters (CA) |
| Bonamici | Hensarling | Pingree (ME) |
| Brady (PA) | Higgins | Pittenger |
| Brady (TX) | Himes | Pitts |
| Bridenstine | Hinojosa | Pocan |
| Brown (GA) | Holt | Polis |
| Brown (FL) | Horsford | Pompeo |
| Butterfield | Hoyer | Posey |
| Capps | Huelskamp | Price (GA) |
| Capuano | Huffman | Price (NC) |
| Cárdenas | Hurt | Quigley |
| Carney | Israel | Radel |
| Carson (IN) | Jackson Lee | Rangel |
| Cartwright | Jeffries | Richmond |
| Castor (FL) | Johnson (GA) | Rigell |
| Castro (TX) | Johnson, E. B. | Rohrabacher |
| Chabot | Jones | Rothfus |
| Chu | Jordan | Roybal-Allard |
| Cicilline | Kaptur | Royce |
| Clarke | Keating | Ruiz |
| Clay | Kelly (IL) | Ruppersberger |
| Cleaver | Kennedy | Rush |
| Clyburn | Kildee | Ryan (OH) |
| Coffman | Kilmer | Ryan (WI) |
| Cohen | Kind | Salmon |
| Collins (GA) | Kirkpatrick | Sánchez, Linda |
| Connolly | Kuster | T. |
| Conyers | Labrador | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Cook | Lamborn | Sanford |
| Cooper | Lance | Sarbanes |
| Cotton | Langevin | Scalise |
| Courtney | Larson (CT) | Schakowsky |
| Crowley | Lee (CA) | Schiff |
| Culberson | Levin | Schneider |
| Cummings | Lewis | Schwartz |
| Davis (CA) | Lipinski | Schweikert |
| Davis, Danny | LoBiondo | Scott (VA) |
| DeFazio | Lofgren | Scott, David |
| DeGette | Lowenthal | Sensenbrenner |
| Delaney | Lowe | Serrano |
| DeLauro | Lujan Grisham | Sewell (AL) |
| DelBene | (NM) | Shea-Porter |
| DeSantis | Luján, Ben Ray | Sherman |
| Deutch | (NM) | Shuster |
| Dingell | Lynch | Sires |
| Doggett | Maffei | Smith (NJ) |
| Doyle | Maloney, | Smith (WA) |
| Duckworth | Carolyn | Speier |
| Duncan (SC) | Maloney, Sean | Stockman |
| Duncan (TN) | Massie | Stutzman |
| Edwards | Matheson | Swalwell (CA) |
| Ellison | Matsui | Takano |
| Engel | McClintock | Thompson (CA) |
| Eshoo | McCollum | Thompson (MS) |
| Esty | McDermott | Tierney |
| Fattah | McGovern | Titus |
| Fleming | Meehan | Tonko |
| Foster | Meeks | Tsongas |
| Frankel (FL) | Meng | Van Hollen |
| Franks (AZ) | Michaud | Vargas |
| Fudge | Miller (FL) | Veasey |
| Gabbard | Miller, George | Velázquez |
| Gallo | Moore | Visclosky |
| Garrett | Moran | Wasserman |
| Gingrey (GA) | Mulvaney | Schultz |
| Gohmert | Nadler | Waters |
| Goodlatte | Napolitano | Watt |
| Gowdy | Neal | Waxman |
| Graves (GA) | Negrete McLeod | Welch |
| Grayson | Nolan | Wenstrup |
| Green, Al | O'Rourke | Wilson (FL) |
| Green, Gene | Pallone | Wolf |
| Grijalva | Pascrell | Yarmuth |
| Gutiérrez | Pastor (AZ) | Young (FL) |
| Hahn | Payne | |

NOT VOTING—6

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| Honda | Markey | Miller, Gary |
| Larsen (WA) | McCarthy (NY) | Slaughter |

□ 1354

Messrs. COFFMAN and SHUSTER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on

agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably detained at a meeting and missed the first votes of the day.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 254, the motion on ordering the previous question on the rule; and “no” on rollcall No. 253, H. Res. 271, the rule providing for further consideration of H.R. 1947, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 475. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include vaccines against seasonal influenza within the definition of taxable vaccines.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 23. An act to designate as wilderness certain land and inland water within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes.

S. 25. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District and for other purposes.

S. 26. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project.

S. 112. An act to expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness in the State of Washington, to designate the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River and Pratt River as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes.

S. 130. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming.

S. 157. An act to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 230. An act to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

S. 244. An act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project.

S. 276. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir.

S. 304. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes.

S. 352. An act to provide for the designation of the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area in the State of Oregon, to designate segments of Wasson and Franklin Creeks in the State of Oregon as wild rivers, and for other purposes.

S. 383. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

S. 393. An act to designate additional segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, in the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

S. 459. An act to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes.

S. 579. An act to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, and for other purposes.

□ 1400

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2702 and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress, effective June 24, 2013:

Mr. Jeffrey W. Thomas, Columbus, Ohio

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet in pro forma session at 11 a.m.; no votes are expected. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business; votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, I expect the House to take up and pass two bills from the Natural Resources Committee: H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, authored by Chairman DOC HASTINGS; and H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon

Agreements Authorization Act, sponsored by Representative JEFF DUNCAN of South Carolina. These two bills continue our efforts to increase domestic energy production to foster an environment of economic growth and lower energy costs for working families.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I anticipate bringing to the floor H.R. 2410, the Agriculture appropriations bill authored by Representative ROBERT ADERHOLT of Alabama.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would ask him a couple of questions about bills that are not on the announcement. The gentleman and I had a colloquy last week about student loans, that there's no action on those on the calendar for next week, if I'm correct.

Knowing, as we know, that student loan rates will double in July from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, and in light of our discussion last week, can the gentleman tell me whether there is any thought that there will be some action taken by us prior to the July 4 break?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows that the House has acted, that the position of the House is one very close to where the President's public position on student loans has been. We don't want to see student loan rates double. We also want a long-term solution to the problem on the fiscal end while helping students.

And if the gentleman witnesses what just happened on the floor, it just seems that on bills where there are solutions and bipartisan indications of support, there seems to be a decision by the part of his leadership, perhaps himself, to say, Hey, we're not going to go along with bipartisan work and success, and maybe we're just going to make this a partisan issue. I'm fearful the same is at work on the student loan issue, Mr. Speaker.

I hope that that is not the case, because I know the gentleman shares with me a desire not to allow students to be put in the position of facing a doubling of interest rates if they decide to incur additional student loans.

□ 1410

So I would say to the gentleman, his question, we will stand ready to work in a bipartisan fashion—I've indicated so to the White House. The Senate doesn't seem to be able to produce anything. The House is the only one that produced something—very close to what the President's position is—to make student rates variable, to allow for those rates to be capped so the exposure is not what it would be otherwise. Unfortunately, no movement yet. We stand ready to work though.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Very frankly, I wasn't going to mention what happened on the floor today, but the gentleman has brought it up.

The gentleman is correct; the committee passed out a bipartisan bill. A

lot of Democrats voted for that bill. The problem, of course, is that 62 Republicans voted against the bill as it was amended, notwithstanding the fact they voted for the last amendment that was adopted, which we think was a draconian amendment that would have hurt the poorest citizens in our country very badly.

So we turned a bipartisan bill into a partisan bill. I will tell my friend, very frankly, you did the same thing—not you personally, but your side of the aisle did the same thing with respect to the Homeland Security bill, which was reported out on a voice vote from the Appropriations Committee, that we would have voted for on a bipartisan basis, except an amendment was adopted with your side voting overwhelmingly for it, knowing full well that our side could not support that.

So I tell you, with all due respect, Mr. Majority Leader, I wasn't going to bring up what happened today. But what happened today is you turned a bipartisan bill—necessary for our farmers, necessary for our consumers, necessary for the people of America—that many of us would have supported and you turned it into a partisan bill.

Very frankly, 58 of the 62 Republicans who voted against your bill voted for the last amendment, which made the bill even more egregious—we disagreed with the \$20 billion cut. And you upped the—not you personally, but your side upped the ante.

So I will tell you, my friend, we're prepared to work in a bipartisan fashion. Very frankly, with respect to the student loan bill, it was very close to the President's bill. And we would have supported it had it been even closer to the President's bill.

What your bill does, as you know, puts those taking out a student loan at risk of having their interest rates substantially increased in the future. The President suggested, yes, let's get a variable rate that reflects market rates, but then when you take out the loan, just like you do with your house loan, you know what your interest rate is going to be. So we have a difference on that. I think it's a good faith disagreement on that.

But I will say to you that, yes, I have been concerned about the inability to take a bill reported out of the committee that is bipartisan in nature and not turn it into a partisan bill. That's what happened on this floor today. It was unfortunate, as I say, for farmers; it was unfortunate for consumers; and it was unfortunate for our country.

If the gentleman wants to pursue that, I will yield to him.

Mr. CANTOR. I appreciate the gentleman, Mr. Speaker. And allow me to just to respond.

The Southerland amendment to which the gentleman speaks is an amendment that had been discussed for some time with the ranking member, with the chairman—the gentleman himself, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, was aware of Mr. SOUTHERLAND's amendment.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND's amendment reflects what many of us believe is a successful formula to apply to a program that has, in the eyes of the GAO, in the eyes of the independent auditors who look at these programs, a program that is in dire need of improvement because of the error rates and the waste and the other things that are occurring in this program.

In addition to that, it reflects our strong belief that able-bodied people should have the opportunity and should go in and be a productive citizen. That's what this amendment says. It gives States an option. It was a pilot project because it reflects a winning formula from the welfare reform program back in 1996 that was put into place, with unequivocal success—able-bodied people going back to work, working families beginning to have productive income, not just taking a check from the government.

There was never an intention at all for our side to say we want to take away the safety net of the food stamp program, absolutely not. This was a pilot project, that was it. It was up to the States whether they wanted to participate to see if they could get more people back to work. Again, consistent with what the GAO reports have said over and over again, these programs are in need of reform.

Again, it was not as if this amendment came out of thin air. The gentleman, the ranking member, the entire leadership on the minority side knew this amendment was there. And the gentleman forever is on this floor, Mr. Speaker, talking about regular order, talking about the need for us to have open process, perhaps to let the will of the House be worked and then go to conference. That was what the goal here was, let the will of the House allowed to be seen through, work its will, and then go to conference. And then we would try and participate in a robust discussion with the other side of the Capitol to see if we could see clear on some reform measures to a bill and a program that is in desperate need of that.

Mr. Speaker, again, what we saw today was a Democratic leadership in the House that was insistent to undo years and years of bipartisan work on an issue like a farm bill and decide to make it a partisan issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that that is the case, I do agree with the gentleman. But I hope that we can see our way to working on other issues where there is potential agreement. Yes, we have fundamental disagreements on many things, but we're all human beings, representing the 740-some thousand people that put us here and expect us to begin to learn to set aside those disagreements and find ways we can work together.

Today was an example. The other side, Mr. Speaker, did not think that was their goal, did not think that was an appropriate mission, and instead decided to emphasize where they perhaps

differed when we wanted to reform in a certain area.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. We clearly have a profound disagreement.

When we were in the majority, we got no help on your side, Mr. Majority Leader—you remember that, zero, one, two, three, four—on programs that we felt very strongly about. There was no opportunity to have bipartisan dialogue. There was no opportunity to have bipartisan agreement.

The gentleman refers to regular order. Very frankly, the person who talks about regular order most is your Speaker. And you talk about regular order. We ought to pass a bill, and then we ought to go and have an agreement.

Some 90 days ago, I believe, we passed a budget. At your insistence, the Senate passed a budget. Good for them. We have not gone to conference. You have not provided an opportunity to go to conference. You haven't appointed conferees. That's regular order. The gentleman wants it on one bill but apparently not all bills.

I tell my friend we want regular order. We want to go to conference. We want to undo the breaking of an agreement that we made in the Budget Control Act, which said there would be a firewall between domestic and defense. You have eliminated that firewall.

You have assumed sequester is in place. Sequester is bad for this country. You and I tend to agree on that, I think. But the fact is there's no legislation to undo that sequester—except the legislation you talked about passing in the last Congress, which is dead, gone and buried. Yes, we want regular order.

The reason the bill lost today is because 62 of your Members rejected Mr. LUCAS' plea—which I thought was a very eloquent plea—in which he said: I know some of you don't think there's enough reform in this bill, and some of you think there's too much reform. But Mr. PETERSON and I brought out a bill that was a bipartisan bill, supported by the majority of Democrats and the majority of—I think all Republicans, maybe, on the committee; I'm not sure of that, Mr. Leader. But the fact of the matter is it was a bipartisan bill—just as Homeland Security was a bipartisan bill—and it was turned into a partisan bill.

You respond that the Southland amendment was for reforms. That's exactly what Mr. LUCAS was talking about. He was saying some people don't think we went far enough and some people think we went too far. Mr. SOUTHERLAND thought we hadn't gone far enough. And 58 Republicans voted for SOUTHERLAND and then turned around and voted against the bill, the very reforms you're talking about.

So don't blame Democrats for the loss today. You didn't bring up the farm bill when it was reported out on a bipartisan basis. Last year you didn't even bring it to the floor because your party couldn't come together supporting their chairman's bill.

□ 1420

So that's where we find ourselves, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't going to bring up that bill at all. What happened, happened.

Very frankly, when we lost on the floor, it was because we lost on the floor when we were in the majority. We produced 218 votes for almost everything we put on this floor. Don't blame Democrats for the failure to bring 218 Republicans to your bipartisan Lucas-supported and Peterson-supported piece of legislation on the floor. We believe that that loss, that partisanship on this bill, hurt farmers, hurt consumers, hurt our country.

Let's bring that bill back to the floor and have a vote on it as it was reported out on a bipartisan basis. I think it would pass. Maybe not because of your votes. That's been your problem all along.

Don't blame Democrats for the loss of that bill. Don't blame Democrats for being partisan.

We knew about those amendments, Mr. Leader, just as you knew about them. You knew we were very much opposed to some of those amendments, notwithstanding the fact all the leadership, I believe—I haven't looked at the record—voted for those amendments just as they voted for the King amendment on Homeland Security.

Yeah, you pushed my button.

I'm prepared to work in a bipartisan fashion, but I'm not prepared to work in a bipartisan fashion when it's said, This is what we agree on—meaning your side—so you better take it if we're going to have any agreement. That's not the way it works. It never worked that way in America. That's not what America is about. America is about expecting us to work together.

This bill was reported out overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis. It could have been passed on a very large bipartisan vote, and was precluded by the actions taken through these amendments on the floor, most of which we did not support. You knew we did not—not only you. Your party knew that we did not support.

So I'm surprised when you talk to me about regular order and there's nothing—nothing—to do on the budget conference that you wanted the Senate to pass a budget. They did. You have just told me that you wanted regular order and that we should have passed the farm bill so we could work together.

You're assuming, of course, that the Senate would have gone to conference. I hope they would have, and I think they would have, because I talked to the chair. She would have wanted to go to conference, assuming we got votes on the Republican side of the aisle.

But we also wanted to go to conference in regular order on the budget to solve the stark differences between the two parties. That's the only way you are going to get from where we are to where you need to be, by having a conference and trying to come to an agreement.

My own premise is, Mr. Leader, that you don't have a conference because there is nothing to which PATTY MURRAY could agree, that Mr. RYAN could agree, that he could bring back to your caucus and get a majority of votes for, because they are for what you passed and nothing more than that. We are \$91 billion apart. If we divide it in two and just said, "Okay, we'll split the difference," you couldn't pass it on your side of the aisle, and I think you know that.

I don't know that I have any more questions that would be particularly useful, but I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just say, as far as the budget conference is concerned, the budget is something that traditionally, as he notes, has been a partisan affair. It is a document that each House produces, reflecting the philosophy of the majority of those bodies.

The budget contains a lot of different issues, two of which I think the parties have disagreed on vehemently over the last several years: taxes and health care.

We understand, Mr. Speaker, that the other side rejects our prescription on how to fix the deficit in terms of the unfunded liabilities on the health care programs. We've said we want to work toward a balance. We think a balanced budget is a good thing.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the partisan position on the other side of the Capitol is no balance—no balance—and raise taxes. So when you know that is the situation, there is no construct in which to even begin a discussion.

Again, the budget has traditionally been that, a partisan document, whether who is in charge of which House, and then to be a guide by which you go about spending bills after that.

The farm bill, frankly, is a little different. It's for working farmers. It's for, frankly, individuals who need the benefit of the food stamp program. We believe that you need to reform the SNAP program and reduce some of the costs, because even the GAO—the independent auditors that we bring in—year in and year out say that that program is rife with error rates, waste, and others that we should be ashamed of.

So we put forward our idea through the Southerland amendment to try and reform, put in place, those reforms; but it's still in the construct of the farm bill.

Again, to the gentleman's point, we do want to work together, but it's going to have to be about setting aside differences instead of saying, as the minority leadership did today, You disagree with us on that program, we're out of here. The entire farm bill then does not have a chance to go to conference, be reconciled, hopefully reforms adopted, so we can make some progress, according to what even the independent analysts say should be done.

It really is a disappointing day. I think that the minority has been a disappointing player today, Mr. Speaker, on the part of the people. We remain ready to work with the gentleman. I'm hopeful that tomorrow, perhaps next week, will be a better week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader continues to want to blame the Democrats for his inability, and the Republicans' inability, to give a majority vote to their own bill.

Maybe the American people, he thinks, can be fooled. You're in charge of the House. You have 234 Members. Sixty-two of your Members voted against your bill. That's why it failed. We didn't whine, very frankly, when we were in charge, when I was the majority leader, about we didn't pass the bill. We got 218 votes for our bills, and it was pretty tough. We got zero from your side. You got 24 from our side to help you. Mr. PETERSON stuck to his deal.

Now, on the budget, you say we've got different philosophies. Yes, we do. Mr. Gingrich gave a speech on this floor about different philosophies in 1997 or '98. He was speaking to your side of the aisle. He was talking about the "perfectionist caucus." He made an agreement with President Clinton, which to some degree was responsible for having balanced budgets, but your side thought it was not a good deal. Not all of your side. In a bipartisan vote, frankly, we passed the deal, the agreement, the compromise, that was reached between Mr. Gingrich and Mr. Clinton.

A lot of your folks said, No, no. Our way or the highway.

He gave a speech that he called the "Perfectionist Caucus" speech. That's what, in my view, I'm hearing on the budget. Yes, we have differences. The American people elected a Democratic President. They elected a Democratic Senate and a Republican House. The only way America's board of directors and President will work is if we come together and compromise.

The place to compromise under regular order is in a conference with our ideas and their ideas meeting in conference. The most central document that we need to do every year is to do a budget. But you're not going to conference. Your side will not appoint conferees. Your side will not move to go to conference. PATTY MURRAY wants to go to conference. Senator REID wants to go to conference. Your side over on the Senate won't go to conference, in my view, largely because they know you don't want to go to conference and they don't want to make a deal, they don't want to compromise on what their position is.

We will take no blame for the failure of the FARRM Bill—none, zero. As much as you try to say it, you can't get away from the statistic. Sixty-two, otherwise known as 25 percent, of your party voted against a bill, which is why we didn't bring it to the floor last year

when it was also reported out in a bipartisan fashion.

I know you are going to continue and your side is going to continue to blame us that you couldn't get the votes on your side for your bill because you took a bipartisan bill. That's what Mr. LUCAS was saying—I thought he was very articulate, I thought he was compelling—in pleading with your side: Join us, join us. It doesn't go as far as you would like.

And on reform, you talk about reform, and that's a good thing to talk about, like we're against reform.

□ 1430

The Senate bill has reform in it, Mr. Leader. The Senate bill has reform in it. Now, it's not in terms of dollars cutting poor people as much as this bill does, but it cuts. It has reform in it. What some of them want—what apparently your side wants—is your reform, not compromised reform. Mr. LUCAS brought to the floor \$20 billion and couched it as reform and said on the floor it may not be enough for some and it may be too much for others, but it is a compromise. He was right, but it was rejected by 25 percent of your party—they rejected the chairman—and that's why this bill failed.

Unless the gentleman wants to say something further, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 24, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Monday, June 24, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOHMERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

FARM BILL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, politics trumped good government today in the U.S. House of Representatives. The Members of this body demonstrated a failure to lead by voting down the farm bill.

The Federal Government currently operates a costly maze of duplicative and outdated agriculture spending programs. The farm bill crafted by the House reflected a fiscally responsible plan that would have ended the abuses of food stamps, ended wasteful agriculture spending programs and, achieved a level of efficiency for existing programs that should be replicated in all areas of government.

The farm bill would have eliminated automatic enrollment in food stamps and prevented fraudulent benefit payments by requiring States to verify eligibility for the program. The farm bill

would have ended the economically disruptive policies that have worked to further destabilize our dairy markets. The bill transitioned to a more free market approach that's better for farmers and taxpayers alike.

In the absence of this comprehensive reform package, the overspending and taxpayer waste will now continue.

DENHAM-SCHRADER AMENDMENT

(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Ladies and gentlemen, what we have here today is a failure to communicate.

I am truly disappointed in this House because the farm bill that we just voted on and that did not pass was not ready because it was not balanced and it did not follow the rules as it should have.

\$20 billion from the mouths of the poorest children and families in America—that's one of the reasons I voted "no" on that bill. I also voted against the bill, in part, because we did not even debate an amendment that I also endorsed, which was the Denham-Schrader amendment. That would have been the appropriate thing to do, the proper order. We didn't take the proper order.

I think it's very important for all of us to understand that what we witnessed here today wasn't a failure of government; it was a failure of some individuals to do the right thing and to even follow the rules that they say they want to follow. That's why we don't have a farm bill that passed. Hopefully, we can get back on track, follow the rules and pass a farm bill very soon.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This week marks the 50th anniversary of National Small Business Week.

Each year, we devote one week to recognize the importance of small businesses and to honor their successes. While it is admirable to devote a week to small businesses, what we have to remember is that every week is small business week and that the family farm, which we discussed here on the floor today, was, in fact, the original small business. Small businesses are the backbone of our economy and the engines of job creation. Over half of Americans own or are employed by a small business.

Mr. Speaker, there are 30 million small businesses in the United States, and they create seven out of every 10 new American jobs each and every year. Small businesses are the key to economic prosperity. The government does not create jobs; American small businesses create jobs.

The government and its lawmakers should do everything in their power to cultivate an ideal environment for small businesses to grow and prosper by removing roadblocks to growth and by building economic certainty. We need to keep the focus on the American worker and on small businesses. We need to remember that every week is small business week.

THE FARM BILL—A PARTISAN PRODUCT

(Mr. GALLEGO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEGO. I rise reluctantly to express my disappointment in today's proceedings. I am one of those Democrats who voted for a bipartisan product coming out of committee; but unfortunately, today, the bill that we saw come out of committee became an extremely partisan product towards the end.

One of the challenges for me was that I am a firm believer in the SNAP program. It's an anti-hunger safety net that serves vulnerable children and seniors across our country. The average benefit is \$4.50 a day. That's a lifeline. That's not a luxury. In 2010, SNAP helped more than 3.6 million people in Texas afford food. It's critical to children and seniors. In the 23rd Congressional District, there are 36,000 households receiving SNAP. The vast majority is of households with working class families and working class families with young kids.

Today was a disappointment. I was perfectly prepared to work for a product that we could get to conference—I had my card to vote green—but it seemed, in watching the debate here and the finger-pointing immediately—the blame of who did what to whom—was just so frustrating.

The truth is that we've got to get somewhere in the middle. When you continually offer these amendments that move us further and further off the middle and that move us further and further and further to the right, it makes it increasingly difficult to support what should be a bipartisan product.

DON'T TAKE FOOD FROM ME

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Most of America would ask the question: What happened here today?

I can probably say that what happened here today is a little hand of a hungry child that was raised up, and the child said: What about me?

You can talk about farms—little ones and big ones. I am a big supporter of our agricultural production in this Nation—it is from the soil—but I am very glad that we stood up for the children who are faced and confronted with \$20

billion in cuts from something that stamps out hunger. Households with children receive about 75 percent of all food stamp benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we didn't want to just stop there.

We didn't want to just take food from 200,000 hungry children. We wanted to make sure that, if you are a disabled parent with a young child—and if you don't have child care and if you can't find a job—your SNAP money would not be given to you by the State, and the State would be able to keep it. We didn't just want to take food out of a hungry child's mouth. We wanted to slap him down. We wanted to make sure that the State would be grinning by saying, Ha, ha, ha, not only do you not get food, but—in the same breath—we get to keep the money.

We are better than this as America. We can do better. This bill was defeated because the hand of a hungry child was able to be heard on the floor of this House. I am glad that I stood with the hungry child and stamped out hunger in that child's heart, stomach and mind. Today, a child's voice, as sweet and quiet as it is, Mr. Speaker, was loud and clear: don't take food from me.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

□ 1440

JUNETEENTH AND SNAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it's not often that one is able to come back to the podium as soon as I have, and I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

I started to speak about unfinished business, but first I want to celebrate and acknowledge a day this week that many of us commemorate. In fact, it is moving to become nationally recognized. It's something that is called "Juneteenth."

Today is June 20. So yesterday, June 19, was Juneteenth. I didn't get a chance to explain what Juneteenth meant on the floor of the House, and I wanted to do so.

In 1865, the captain of a Union army arose and arrived on the shores of Galveston, Texas, to let the then slaves who had not been notified, who had not been freed in 1863, on January 1 when President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, finally the Union came to our shores in Texas and let a whole swath of slaves who were still working and toiling unpaid in conditions that were obviously unsatisfactory, because no one should hold

slaves. Finally, in 1865, on June 19, those in Texas and places to the west were freed. So it is a day of freedom.

When I talk to children about Juneteenth, I say it is living freedom. It is accepting the values of this great Nation that has turned, I hope, forever against the idea of holding others as slaves. And it moved this Nation forward, even in difficulty, with women not being able to vote and African Americans moving from Reconstruction into Jim Crowism and the terrible times of the 1900s and, as well, moving into the time of second-class citizenship all the way through World War II as President Truman integrated the United States military. But it moved the country to a lust and a desire for freedom and opportunity.

So Juneteenth is a day of jubilation. It is a day when families gather together. But it is a very important historic time. It is a historic time, if you will, to be able to, in fact, acknowledge that what has been wrong can be fixed. It wasn't a pleasant time to, in essence, work as a slave, to be held as a slave, to be captured as a slave some 18 months to almost 2 years after the Emancipation Proclamation.

I say that because I wanted to explain further why something that had traditionally been bipartisan—we love the farm life for those who have experienced it, those who read about it. Often in my tenure here in the United States Congress, urban Members and rural Members came together to pass a bill that generated not only food for America but food for the world. Let it be very clear that we took pride today to vote "no," because sometimes you have to listen and understand that there are things greater than your own interests.

I don't know what reason caused the implementation or the addition of a \$20 billion cut to the SNAP program. Who had to be satisfied to put that gigantic, unsympathetic, cruel taking of food from the plates of Americans on the floor? SNAP has no region, it has no racial identity, it has no age identity. It is, frankly, Americans who are in need.

Let me share with you some numbers. Households with children receive about 75 percent of all food stamp benefits. That immediately quashes the stereotype that deadbeats get food stamps. Twenty-three percent of households include a disabled person. Eighteen percent of households include an elderly person. The food stamp program increases household spending. The increase is greater than would occur with an equal benefit in cash. These people are not asking for cash. They're asking for you to allow them to be able to buy decent food so there is nutrition and nourishment.

But again, what motivated a \$20 billion cut that had never been implemented in an agricultural bill that many of us voted on in a bipartisan manner? Did anybody listen to the chairman of the Federal Reserve? The

Chairman of the Federal Reserve said just yesterday that the economy is percolating, that it's doing all that it needs to do, that they're not going to reduce interest rates yet, and they're monitoring it because jobs are being created—not enough—but the economy is finding ways to restore itself.

It was good news for some of our college students, finding more jobs than they found last year as a college graduate.

So the idea that we need to continue to punish the American people, to wound ourselves because there is something out there called the deficit, this imaginary “continue to undermine the government” standard bearer that everyone wants to use—there is a deficit, but it has been steadily coming down because of the belt tightening.

Now we want to go beyond the belt tightening. We want to go beyond the family of four that says, We are not going to go out as much. We aren't going to have more cereal than we used to have. No, we are going to tell the family of four, You're not going to have any cereal. Just wake up in the morning and drink water. We're going to take everything away, and maybe you'll have one meal a day.

This is absurd, and it is not the American way.

Every \$5 in new food stamp benefits generates almost twice as much—\$9.20—in total community spending. The economics of SNAP and food support programs benefit everyone by preventing new food deserts from developing. The impact of SNAP funds coming into local and neighborhood grocery stores is more profitable. We'll have areas of grocery stores and supermarkets, more jobs for people. SNAP funds going into local food economies also make the cost of food for everyone less expensive.

It is clear that the SNAP program is a valuable program. In fact, SNAP is the largest domestic program in the American domestic hunger safety net. The Food and Nutrition Service program supported by SNAP works with State agencies, nutrition educators and neighborhoods, as well as faith-based organizations, to assist those eligible for nutrition assistance. Food and Nutrition Service programs also work with State partners in the retail community to improve program administration and work to ensure the program's integrity.

Let me tell you beyond the \$20 billion what else occurred. Not only did it involve the \$20 billion in the underlying bill, but that wasn't enough. They offered an amendment on the floor to make it an estimated \$31 billion in cuts. If that isn't outrageous, I don't know what is. Literally, not only have they taken the food, but they've taken the table, the utensils, and are leaving you with a good-looking floor, if that's what you have, or rough floor, to simply go there and admire food.

□ 1450

This is an outrageous addition. Cutting off benefits of 2 million Americans

extra who struggle to find work, severing the tie between LIHEAP and SNAP, which is the dollars that supplement those who are not able to pay their energy bills in the cold of the winter, how could you? Penalizing those who don't abide by an unnecessary, burdensome job search if you have a disabled child, this is what was on the floor. Not just taking food away, but literally dismantling the table.

Oh, that wasn't enough. Then they wanted to do this. This looks like a great idea. As you well know, varying States have different economic positions. Some States are thriving because of the industry they have. A State like Texas has an energy-based, oil-based economy. Some States have other kinds of economies, and those economies are coming back, but there are still poor people and people without jobs. And this is what the SNAP program is for. It is not for fraud, waste, and abuse. I don't have any problem with oversight. But how dare you take food away from children, cutting out school lunches, cutting out school breakfasts that sometimes are the difference between a child learning and surviving.

But that wasn't enough. Listen to another amendment that was offered and passed on the floor of the House. It makes the SNAP policies, this amendment, even worse than what I've just discussed. It would allow States to pocket, put in their pocket, smack their lips, roll their hands, the savings if they cut people off of the Supplemental Nutrition program. That means the disabled, parents with young children who don't have child care, those who are unable to find work in the area they're in because there are no jobs available in that community. And there are census data and census tracts where you cannot find jobs. This amendment would find no funding for job search or job creation to help recipients of the SNAP program find work, and it places no restrictions on what States can use the bonus moneys that they put in their pocket for.

Oh, they can throw it for all kinds of unnecessary extras, if you will. Maybe they can do extra security for roaming elected officials. And when I say that, my State is quarreling over whether it should pay security costs for our Governor. Maybe it can throw a few extra parties. Maybe it can build another bridge to nowhere. What will they do when they take money—money—out of the mouths of babes into their pocket?

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlelady, because it is with a full heart that I come to the well of the House and address the Members to say that the gentlelady from Texas and I didn't see eye to eye on every part of this bill, although we are in the same party. And those of us

who are new to this Congress, who came here to work because we heard that the American people wanted us to work together and solve problems, those of us on the Agriculture Committee approached this bill with an open mind and with a willingness to compromise, and we did so.

We worked together to include in this bill the best combination of things that we thought would help the American people, and in my case, the people of the Hudson Valley. And that meant that we also tolerated things that we disagreed with very strongly, Mr. Speaker, but we moved the process forward because we believed if we brought it to the floor of the House, and if the House passed it and we sent it to conference with the Senate, that we would be able to accept the compromise in good faith that this body worked out.

But what happened today on the floor of the House of Representatives was that the extremism of a small number of people has set back progress for the rest of us. Once again, the insistence on something so extreme has defeated good-faith efforts, like those of my colleagues, particularly the new Members of Congress on the Agriculture Committee who wanted to reach an honorable compromise, to make progress for our farmers, to help our dairy farmers in particular, to help our conservation efforts, to help our beginning farmers, to help folks with flood mitigation, particularly in the black dirt region of Orange County, New York, that I represent. We thought we could work together.

And what we saw today, what we learned today, was that extremism is still alive and well on the floor of this House, and that there are those who would rather destroy the fragile efforts of bipartisan cooperation than work together on something that we can all move forward together with that will help the American people and help our farmers.

The Southerland amendment, which the gentlelady has properly described, is so punitive, so mean spirited that it would deny basic food assistance to women with small children, to people with disabilities. It would require work where there is no work. It is not designed to be reform. It was designed to kill this bill, and it succeeded in that purpose today, by destroying the good-faith efforts of those who worked together.

Once again, tea party extremism has destroyed the efforts of people of good faith to make progress and get results. It is a sad day in the House of Representatives, and it's a tough education for those of us who have come here ready to work together across the aisle and who have much proven that with our votes in a bipartisan fashion to move this bill forward, despite the presence of things we didn't like.

I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to bring this bill back to floor because it matters. It matters for our farmers. It matters for our communities in the Hudson Valley. We can

work together to improve it, but we must stop these destructive efforts to stop all progress.

I thank the gentlelady.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I applaud the gentleman for his honesty and for his work, because as I began this debate, we have always voted in a bipartisan manner on the farm bill. For those of us in the urban areas that touch a little rural area or live in States that have large pockets of rural areas, we are well aware that we are the breadbasket of the world. When we travel the world, we are always eager to see the food products. That has been our nomenclature. That has been our name. That's been what America is known for, not only its generosity and its heart, but its willingness to feed the hungry.

As I indicated, who could craft an amendment that would deep-six this bill, adding insult to the \$20 billion that I know the gentleman indicated we were looking to compromise on in the conference. But to say to the gentleman, we all would hope the bill will come back. Maybe it might even come back with the recognition that the \$20 billion is spiking too high. But certainly the Southerland amendment, and the one previously that did not pass that wanted to cut even more from the \$20 billion, if I might say, it's an oxymoron between the farm and those who need to eat. We always work together, and we were able to produce products and enough food to give those who were hungry and those who could not find work.

I want to make mention of the fact, as the gentleman said, that included in taking their food away from them, as the gentleman said, was the disabled and the parents with young children.

And so I want to thank the gentleman for his words and, of course, for his leadership for his area and also on this topic.

So that is two Members from two distinct places, Democrats, who would have been able to come and find a reasoned way to address this bill.

Might I also say that I do thank the committee for acknowledging an amendment to be able to reach out, my amendment, the Jackson Lee amendment that was included; but I'm willing to sacrifice that amendment that was to reach out and create opportunities for minority businesses, women-owned businesses, family farmers, Black farmers who have been discriminated against for eons under the Agriculture Department. My amendment would have caused a specific outreach to these individuals, and I'm glad for it.

I was able to support the McGovern amendment, which had an offset that I believe was a proper offset that would have put the money, \$20 billion, back in.

Again, I want to remind my colleagues, our deficit is going down. Our economy is percolating. I didn't say it was perfect. I didn't say everyone had a

job. But what I did say is we're making progress. Why are we continuing to do injury for those who cannot speak for themselves? I do not know.

Again, I was eager to see in this bill, to be able to work with more urban gardens, community gardens, what we call victory gardens.

□ 1500

They've been successful in the city of Houston, in Acres Homes, in fact, in Fifth Ward. I see them as progress, the growing of food, the putting food on the tables, healthy food, of people who don't have the means to get good vegetables and to be able to use those urban gardens to teach children to help families come together and to be able to take home good food.

I want to pay tribute to the Houston Food Bank in my congressional district that has brought so many people together. But I can tell you that they're not lacking in business, and the \$20 billion of this SNAP program going down, meaning, being taken away, one of the largest food banks in America, would have been impacted negatively by the idea of the lack of the supplemental nutrition program.

I wanted to also make sure that we had an assessment of helping the older Americans have accessible and affordable nutrition, one of my amendments that did not get in. But when we see older Americans, we can tell sometimes that they're making choices between food and, obviously, their medicine, their prescriptions.

I wanted to make sure that we had had a special commitment to helping them build up their access to nutritious food, along with those who suffer with disabilities. I wish that had gotten in.

And then I wanted to make sure that we did not turn our backs on obesity and juvenile obesity. Just this week the medical community has joined and named obesity as a disease; and my amendment would have had a sense of Congress that encourages food items being provided pursuant to the Federal school breakfast and school lunch program, and that the kind of nutritious items should be selected, and so we can bring down the incidence of juvenile obesity and maximize nutritional value and take away the possibility of our children not having the right kind of nutrition.

So I am eager to get back to the drawing board. But I walked through neighborhoods that suffer from the lack of access to food, and, as well, I'm aware of something called food deserts, where the only place that you can buy is the local gasoline, gas station location.

And maybe you can find an apple or a banana, but mostly what you're going to find is a lot of, if you will, the other kind of food. Some have called it junk food. Pretty tasty. Make sure there's a market for it. It's always good to have fun, but it's not what you have to raise children, to provide for

those who are ill, disabled, parents who cannot work. That's not where they should be shopping.

Food deserts exist in rural and urban areas and are spreading, as a result, fewer farms, as well as fewer places to access fresh fruit, vegetables, proteins and other foods, and that's why this bill is important, to help our small farmers, but also to help those get assistance.

And by the way, the supplemental nutrition program is not welfare, because there are many people who are working who are on food stamps, but their income is such that they cannot provide the nutritious food for their children.

But the main insult is the loss of these dollars for our breakfast and lunch program, that no matter whether you're living in rural America or urban America, your child has the ability to have a good, warm, hot meal for lunch and for breakfast to get them started and ready to learn.

And, therefore, it avoids the metabolic function that comes from malnutrition that causes the breakdown in tissue. For example, the lack of protein in the diet leads to disease and decay of teeth and bones.

Another example of health disparities in food deserts are the presence of fast-food establishments. Again, it's good to have fun; but if that is all that you eat, then you know that that is not going to make for a healthy young person, child, in the growing years, the maturing years, the years that their cognitive skills are growing, the years that they're strengthening their physical being in order to grow into an adult that will be healthy.

And so many of us took the SNAP challenge, the supplemental nutrition challenge, to live on \$4.50. And I went to the grocery store, and I was so scared about going over. I bought one apple, one banana, two apricots. I bought an avocado and a tomato and two potatoes, and I was calculating in my mind, because this was \$4.50 for the day.

And I went to the meat area and looked at, of all things, chopped meat, hamburger meat. I couldn't find anything that would even fit. They were all \$5, \$4.

I kept looking, cheese, too expensive. And I found something in a package called smoked chicken. And in this store, they had it for 58 cents, processed smoked chicken. And I said that I can use for protein.

And so the meal, in my mind, was going to be an apricot, and a banana for breakfast; lunch, you boil a potato with sliced tomatoes, which you would save for your big meal, your dinner.

But every day, a family has to look at \$4.50 to have their meals. And so for anyone that thinks that this is a bunch of folk who enjoy getting these food stamps to have a jolly good time, I'm glad that I experienced that purchase and what you get for \$4.50.

And yet on the floor of the House today, there were those who were willing to put up a bill that would take \$20

billion and, literally, as I started to say, and have said, dismantle the kitchen, dismantle the table, take the utensils and just say, plop down on the floor.

And as we came to the end of the bill, that was not enough. The Southerland amendment came forward and said, not only are we going to insult you and take all the utensils and table away, but we're going to make it a boondoggie.

We're going to give incentives. We're going to make it a gambling opportunity for our States. We're going to let them throw the dice. How many can you get off of SNAP? And if you get them off, you'll be able to pocket the money.

We don't want to control what you do with it. We're not going to suggest that you put it in education, or maybe give back to the schools so they can get a different kind of meal for the child that's lost the breakfast program. No, we don't care.

You're just going to pocket the money and run off into the hills.

States have many burdens. I'm a champion of our States. I love my State. But I've seen the tough debates that my State legislators have had, fighting to get a few parcels for food, for education dollars, for infrastructure dollars.

So I know it's tough; but as I said, some States are a little bit more better off than others. It's all about priorities.

And I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that today we didn't commend ourselves well. I want to go back. I want to be able to, if you will, I want to be able to put the table, the utensils back, the table cloth.

I want to be able to have a poor family have a nutritious meal. I want to be able to have a child have a lunch or breakfast. I want a disabled person to be able to have the right kind of food to help them in their illness. I want an elderly person to be able to have their prescription drugs and, as well, to be able to have food that will nourish them.

I close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I spoke about unfinished business. And as we go forward, I join my colleague from New York, call upon the good people of this House, who represent the good Americans of this Nation, to come back together and find a way that passes a farm bill that does not put on the sacrificial table of destruction poor people who, through no fault of their own, are unemployed or disabled, or have children, or are only able to support the children and provide for them in this way because they live in an area where there are no jobs.

They hope there'll be jobs. They want there to be jobs but, at this point, it hasn't come.

□ 1510

I conclude my remarks by saying in a list of things that we must do as unfinished business, I look forward, as well,

to our being able to join some mothers that stood with me earlier this week, mothers that demand action, and they ask me about the idea of protecting their children with sensible gun legislation that would prevent gun violence. I hope, among other initiatives, a universal background check will also look to laws that will require the storage of one's guns, none of which impact or take away from the Second Amendment.

Then I hope in unfinished business that we will continue to find, in a bipartisan way, a pathway forward for helping those individuals who came to this country, through no fault of their own, who come to this country and are working and don't want to do us harm, but simply want to find a way to stay in a country that they love, and, as well, to say to the American people that we take no shortness in your need and commitment for border security.

I don't see why we can't do it all. That is not unheard of. It is not impossible. It frankly is something that we can go do.

I want to close by saying that I am a person that loves the Constitution, believes in the Bill of Rights, the First Amendment, the freedom of press, speech, the Fourth Amendment that protects you against unreasonable search and seizure, the Griswold v. Connecticut Supreme Court case along with the Ninth Amendment on the question of privacy. So I'm going to make a commitment to my colleagues that we work together on the issue of ensuring the American people's civil liberties while we ensure our national security. We can do both.

I have introduced legislation that would ask for a study of all of the outside contractors that are in the intelligence business and to present that study to the United States Congress and ensure that all those who have top-secret clearance are doing it in the name of this Nation, otherwise to present a plan to reduce that usage by 25 percent by 2014. That is only the fair way because certainly we must have oversight to who has access to your private information and is it access in order to secure this Nation. I stand with them if that is the case.

But I ask the question, why are persons far-flung and unsupervised with top-secret credentials such as the individual who has decided to leak information that is now being assessed? We have to ask the question, are credentials, do they meet the test? Are private contractors making a review of these individuals and assessing them and giving them clearance or if not, not supervising them? I have to ask that question.

And then I would say that it is important that where you can be presented opinions that deal with something we call the FISA court, which is the court that we go into to protect your rights and to be able to go into and make determinations about whether or not there is surveillance, I would

say to you that opinions that will not impact on national security or classified information can be shown to the American people. There's nothing wrong with that.

So I am looking forward to working in a bipartisan way on unfinished business. And I can only say, Mr. Speaker, in my final entreat to this body, the one thing that we should not do is to take the little hand of a child and to push it back from the table or from food. And what we did today was just that.

I want a farm bill, but today I was proud to stand with the children of America who are better off because they've been able to stamp out hunger through a program called SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and will continue to do so until we get it right. Our children are our precious resource.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege of being recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I won't, at this time, take up all the issues that were raised in the previous 45 minutes or so, Mr. Speaker. Instead, I'd like to talk about two topics, though, and one of those topics is the topic of the farm bill which historically, in a sad way, failed here on the floor of the House of Representatives within the last hour or so, hour and a half.

The first thing I want to say about that is that the chairman of the Ag Committee, FRANK LUCAS of Oklahoma, has conducted himself in a fashion that is deserving of and he receives my admiration and should receive that of his constituents and the people of this country.

One of the most difficult balances to achieve in any bill that we produce here in Congress is that 5-year—we call it the “farm bill”—the 5-year farm bill that has roughly 80 percent nutrition in it and about 20 percent agriculture in it. And each 5 years, we try to write the best formula and look into the crystal ball for the next 5 years as well as we can, and it takes the chairman of the Ag Committee, which is the least partisan of the committees here on the Hill, to direct the committee staff—which are very experienced and some of the best staff people we have here on the Hill—to work with the ag staff of the Democrat side, or the opposite party, and work with the ranking member to try to bring together such a variety of issues that have to do with sugar, dairy, crop insurance, nutrition and the qualifications for nutrition, piece after piece of this.

It's like a huge accordion, and the chairman of that committee has got to make decisions on each component of that huge accordion to try to get it lined up in a way that if you go a little too far into the necessary reduction in the food stamp side, you lose votes over here on the Democrat side. If you don't take enough out of there, you lose votes on the Republican side. If you don't take enough money out of agriculture, you lose it over here on some of the conservative side. And on the other hand, if you don't have enough subsidy, you lose votes on the Democrat side.

This is a very difficult balance, Mr. Speaker, and the marriage between the farm bill and the nutrition component of this, or the agriculture component and the nutrition component that we erroneously call the "farm bill" here because of history, that marriage was created out of necessity because the farm program could not be passed on its own. There were too many opponents to that, and the nutrition program had too much opposition on its own. And they married the two together, and each 5 years or so—and it hasn't always happened in 5 years. I don't know when it's ever happened perfectly—it's been dialed together as closely as possible and cooperation was asked from Democrats and Republicans to finally come together and pass a bill.

FRANK LUCAS put that together as perfectly as I think it could be done. I think, Mr. Speaker, that he was a maestro in the way he orchestrated all of this. And I watched as we went through the committee markup. We did one last year and couldn't get floor time to debate a bill. And so the work of the committee wasn't necessarily wasted because we started again this year. We began to put the pieces together again. We had a long markup of the bill, an extended markup of the bill, not as long as it was the previous year, and the pieces came together.

Here's what it needed: it needed to have a strong, bipartisan support coming out of committee before it was going to get floor time, and it needed to have a prospect, a reasonable prospect, of 218 votes here on the floor of the House before that floor time would be granted. And as we have seen from the Speaker, he has consistently said that he wants to see the House work its will.

Now, he let that happen on a continuing resolution in January, or I'll say February of 2011, and we did 92 hours of debate here on the floor under an open rule. And every aspect of the budget was the House working its will, and that was the longest and most expressive way that I have seen this House work its will.

But the Rules Committee here on the farm bill that came out of the Ag Committee allowed a full series of amendments here on the floor. The chairman spoke to that number. I think he said there were over 100 amendments here

on the floor. And, yes, there was an agreement made under unanimous consent to pass a group of them that were not contentious, "en bloc" as we say. I think there was a real sincere effort to work a bill out here on the floor that would come to a conclusion that received 218 votes.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we saw an example of when that didn't work, when an amendment or two or three went on that were more of an objection to that careful and delicate balance that had been put together by FRANK LUCAS. In the end, when the votes could not come together—in a very rare thing—a 5-year bill—that actually has been 6 years since we passed one—failed here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I won't forget this day. I hope that this Congress, I hope the American people, and I hope, especially, the constituents of FRANK LUCAS remember the job that he has done. I don't ever remember seeing anybody in this Congress work so wisely, so honestly, so justly and so carefully to put together something that had to be so carefully balanced to have a glass of cold water thrown in his face is what happened here, I think, on the floor today.

□ 1520

So I wanted to express my regret that the farm bill failed here today, and my appreciation for FRANK LUCAS, for the subcommittee chairs and the ranking members that worked with us on this. Those that gave their word and kept it, I thank all of them. And Mr. Speaker, I'm hopeful that the day will come that that work that has been earned is exonerated by a vote here on the floor of the House. In either case, I want the RECORD to reflect my opinion and my appreciation for FRANK LUCAS.

We've had a big week here, Mr. Speaker. In this big week and this big day that I'll just call yesterday, I look back on it after a full day and I've wondered how one could actually do all of the things that were accomplished yesterday. I just want to run through that narrative because it's fresh in my mind. And that is that yesterday we did the longest press conference in the history of Congress. I don't know what competition there might have been for that—now, who would want to have a long press conference? Well, somebody that wanted to have a long time to air out a huge issue, and the issue was immigration.

I have believed for some weeks now—in fact, 2 or 3 months—that the machinery of this Congress was set up to push immigration—and I'll call it "comprehensive immigration reform," which is of course the euphemism for amnesty—through this Congress faster than the Congress could adjust to it, learn about the policy within the issues, and faster than the American people could learn about it and weigh in. We always need to move at the pace of the American people so that they

have a chance to let us know what they think and we have a chance to digest that policy and make those decisions.

This immigration issue was moving too fast. I believed, and I believe that it was accelerated too quickly in the United States Senate. I believe that today. It's moving too quickly without enough debate. It's too big a decision to be made. I believed, and I believe that it's still moving too quickly through the House of Representatives.

I would point out that there was a Gang of Eight in the Senate—there remains a Gang of Eight in the Senate—that had been meeting in private and holding some press conferences, talking about the things that they were attempting to do, that finally rolled out a bill. I believe it was rolled out at 844 pages long.

The debate and the markup that took place in the Judiciary Committee in the United States Senate was relatively long. There were a good number of amendments that were offered. But most of those votes—some might even say all of those votes—just came down the lines of whether they were part of the deal or whether they weren't part of the deal. So it looked like the Gang of Eight had a deal going into the Judiciary Committee markup. They certainly came out of that with their deal intact, and it's to the floor of the United States Senate today. That's fast and fast track.

While that's going on, the attention of the American people on this issue has been split between the United States Senate and the House. There has been a working group, a bipartisan working group, in the House also. In the Senate, it's four Democrats and four Republicans in the Gang of Eight. In the House, I learned not that long ago that the working group was four Democrats and four Republicans. I also learned that the Speaker encouraged their work, and I learned that they were working in secret for perhaps the last 4 years.

Well, it was in secret. I have, I believe, served more time in the seat, listening and hearing immigration information and reading through reports, probably than anybody else on my side of the aisle over the last decade—although there are two or three that I think have a high level of expertise on immigration policy.

My antennae aren't that weak here, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not picking up the signals of what's going on behind closed doors. We talk, we flow through here to vote, we meet with each other, but I didn't know that there was a secret committee working here out of the House of Representatives that had the blessing of the Speaker. I didn't know that until it was announced by the press some weeks ago. And the secret committee that didn't admit to its existence, some of them facetiously spoke about it as "that secret committee" even though they finally admitted—and the press, I think, ferreted

this out—that they were on that committee. This committee of four Republicans and four Democrats in the House of Representatives that was secret—now it's not a committee of eight any longer, it's a committee of eight minus one, at least as far as I know—their ability to produce a bill seems to have been stalled here in this Congress. I'm not sorry about that.

About the same time that conclusion may have been drawn, I heard our Speaker, I believe it was 2 weeks ago on Friday at his press conference, say he hoped to see immigration legislation pass out of the Judiciary Committee in the month of June. Well, that was a surprise to me. And when the announcement came shortly thereafter that we should clear our schedules for this week and next week as members of the Judiciary Committee to prepare for a markup on immigration, I saw that as a green flag that was dropped that moves the immigration policy more quickly here in the House of Representatives than I'm comfortable with.

But I do not criticize the conduct of our chairman of the Judiciary Committee. BOB GOODLATTE is one of the more astute people on policy that we have in this Congress. He is a seasoned and knowledgeable and smart legislator, and he sees the pieces that are moving and understands what he needs to do to move the right pieces. And I have served with him on two committees now for more than 10 years.

And yet the pace that's going through this Congress may be a wise one. It may be a wise one if enforcement first is what emerges here from the House of Representatives, and if the bill in the Senate can be slowed down or stopped in the Senate.

The consensus that I hear among the Republican Conference in the House of Representatives is this, Mr. Speaker: Stop the bleeding at the border. Shut off the bleeding at the border. Close the border. Get that done. And when you get that done, then come back and talk about the other things.

I'd make the point that when I came here a little more than 10 years ago, I said then let's stop the bleeding at the border. We've got to close the border. I came to this floor, and when people said, well, we can't—I've advocated long that we should build a fence, a wall and a fence on our southern border. And that fence, wall and fence that we can build on the border would be what will help to secure our border. I agree that we would add to that sensory devices, vibration sensors, motion detectors, you name it, add all that to it. But you simply cannot have enough border patrol agents to control 2,000 miles of border with the conditions that we have. They have to rotate shifts, they get their vacations, there's time off. It takes a lot of people on payroll to have enough people on the ground. And we know that there's bleeding through that border, a lot that's crossing through the border.

Mr. Speaker, I went down and did a surprise visit to a point of entry at

Sasabe, Arizona. When I walked in there—they didn't know a Member of Congress was showing up there—I spoke with the shift supervisor, and his name was Mike Kring. He has since passed away, sadly. I think that he was a strong enforcement officer. He was well respected by his men that I saw around him. But I asked him about the frequency of the crossing there, at the legal crossing at the point of entry which is pretty much a rural port of entry in Sasabe, Arizona. And he said, well, this crossing isn't the busiest crossing near here. There is an illegal crossing east of me that's far busier and an illegal crossing west of me that's far busier. This is just our formal crossing. That tells you something about what's going on on the border.

We can close the border. We can do it with the resources that we have. I have long said that. I have not changed my position—I think it's stronger rather than weaker.

I may be the only one that's actually gone back and done the work to calculate what we're spending to defend our southern border. These numbers are old, Mr. Speaker, that I'm about to quote here this afternoon. They come to this: there's a 50-mile area north of our southwest border. Within that 50 miles, you will see Border Patrol agents, Custom and Border Protection agents, you will see ICE agents in there also. The effort that's done to control our border also is the cost of their vehicles, their communications, their benefits package, all of the things that we invest in that area. When you add that all up and you divide it out by the 2,000 miles—which is pretty close to it, it's the best number to use for the length of the border, the southern border—you end up with this number—and this number would be adjusted upward, not downward, to get it more current than the roughly 3 years ago that I'm talking about: \$6 million a mile. We're spending \$6 million a mile, at a minimum, every year to control our southern border. And we're getting, according to Border Patrol testimony before the Immigration Subcommittee, about 25 percent enforcement.

□ 1530

They think that of the 100 people that would try to cross the border they might be stopping about 25 percent. Now, it's probably gotten a little better in the last couple of years. But when I go down to the border, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the agents there candidly, without identifying themselves and without going on public record, what percentage of the illegal border crossers are we interdicting, the most consistent number I get is 10 percent, not 25. Some will smirk and say—or not really smirk, but they will just kind of snort and say, well, 3 or 4 percent. The real answer is we don't know. They know more than we do.

The 10 percent number seems to me to be more likely to be an accurate number than the 25 percent number.

But think of this. At the peak of the illegal border crossings, we would have about 11,000 a night. That comes to 4 million illegal crossing attempts a year. Eleven thousand a night. Twice the size of Santa Anna's army coming across our border every night, on average. And maybe those illegal crossings have been reduced by half—maybe. That's still the size of Santa Anna's army every night.

We are talking about whether we should legalize the people that came across that border. And we're assuming by the argument of, say, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ of Illinois and many others that they're all innocent people that were brought in by their parents—maybe against their will, certainly without their knowledge that there was anything wrong with it or illegal with it, that that's the universe of all the people that are unlawfully present in the United States are just simply those that wanted to come to America for a better life.

Mr. Speaker, I go down to the border. I sit alongside that fence at night. I don't have night vision, but I have ears. I can sit in the dark and I can hear the vehicles come down through the mesquite. In fact, when you hear the one with the bad muffler come back a second time and a third time, you know they're shuttling people to come across the border at night. Within, say, an hour after dark to the next 2 or 3 or 4 hours after dark is when the highest traffic is, because they know they've got to walk across the desert a long ways and they want to make as much time as they can before it turns daylight where they might hole up or where they might be picked up if they can get to the highway north of there.

So I listen and I hear the vehicles come through across the desert. I hear the mesquite scratch alongside the vehicle, and you hear the doors open. Maybe 70, 80, 90, 100 yards south of the border you can hear the doors open. You can hear people get out. First, they open the door. You can hear them drop their pack on the ground. Then they get out and then they close the door, kind of quietly, but it is still a quiet slam of the door. You can hear them pick up their packs, whisper. You hear them walk through the brush, and you can hear them cross the fence.

When you're down there at night without night vision, you sometimes think you see some things you don't see. Have you ever sat around at night in the pitch-black dark and watched? Your mind will play tricks on you.

I can't say into the record, Mr. Speaker, that I saw good numbers of people walk across the border. I know I heard them. That's the only place they could have been going. I heard them go through the fence. I believe I saw the shadows, but I'm not certain of that particular component.

I'm very confident that there are hundreds and hundreds of people that pour across that border at night. That number that I said is roughly half of

11,000, the size of Santa Anna's army, which was 5,000 to 6,000, is roughly the number that we will see every night.

Now, this border is wide open from that perspective. All of the people that came into America aren't those that are coming through that path. All of those people that are coming into America across that border, sometimes you will see a pack train of 75. Every one of them will have a pack of marijuana on their back and they're carrying it into the United States, smuggling it into the United States. Those people fit under the DREAM Act definition, too, if they came into the United States before they were 16 and had been here whatever the length of time might be. If they came here before December 31, 2011, it would be the Senate version of the bill.

I've been on the border, Mr. Speaker, and seen the shadow wolves interdict a smuggler, a marijuana smuggler, coming through with a false bed in the box of a pick-up truck that was extended downward about 7 to 9 inches. Underneath that were the bales of marijuana. I unloaded them myself and took them up to the scales where they were weighed. They weighed approximately 240 pounds.

The reason for that, Mr. Speaker—240 pounds—is because in some sectors of the border they don't have the ability to prosecute drug smugglers and so they set a limit, the prosecutors will set a limit. Sometimes it's you have to have more than 500 pounds of marijuana to be prosecuted; sometimes you have to have more than 250 pounds of marijuana to be prosecuted. The smugglers know that.

I'm going to guess that the sector that I was in that day, the limit was, at least anticipated by the smugglers, to be 250 pounds. So they dialed it under 250 to about 240 pounds and sent their guy through, and he was caught. What we don't know is, was that a decoy so that when all converged on that smuggler, that there wasn't a straight truck through with a couple of tons of marijuana in it. I don't know that. Those are tactics that we see. That's tactics of using sometimes illegal crossings, sometimes going through the legal crossings that we have.

A lot of the border isn't marked. Across New Mexico, there's a concrete pylon from horizon to the next horizon that's just set there, and you would have to know what you were looking for to know where the border is. It's just open desert. I've flown most of that, a lot of that at night. I've also traveled—I'll say that I've traveled probably every mile of our southern border, with the exception of some of the miles along the Texas border, which zigzags quite a lot, and I haven't covered all of that.

Mr. Speaker, we can build a fence, a wall, and a fence, and we can do it with less money than we're spending today on the southern border, over \$6 million a mile on the southern border.

To put this in perspective, to build an interstate across Iowa cornfield—ex-

pensive now, today, expensive Iowa cornfield—we can buy the right-of-way, we can pay for the engineering, we can do the grading and the drainage work and the paving and the shouldering and the painting and the signage and the seeding and the fencing, all of that, and open up a four-lane interstate highway for about \$4 million a mile. We're spending \$6 million on every single mile of our southern border, and we're getting something like 25 percent or less efficiency with what we have there.

Part of it is because the President has declared, by executive edict, amnesty. Even though I think the Border Patrol is doing their job as well as they can within those limits, it's clear that ICE has been handcuffed. We have had the President of the ICE union, Chris Crane, testify before this Congress—I think he's been nine times into this city within the last year and a half or so—doing a stellar job of pointing out that the law requires the Federal immigration officers to place into removal proceedings those people that they encounter that are unlawfully present in the United States. It's their judgment on that that dictates.

Well, the President has prohibited them from doing so through the Morton Memos, the Morton Memos that have been rejected by this Congress in two ways within the last 3 weeks or so. One is a full vote in the House on the King amendment, and the other is a vote in the Judiciary Committee on the King amendment. So we have, every way that we've had the opportunity, rejected the idea that the President can simply make up immigration law out of thin air, decide that he can issue work permits, that he can legalize people that are here illegally, that he can, by executive edict, destroy the rule of law—destroy the rule of law.

I often talk about the pillars of American exceptionalism. We are a great country, Mr. Speaker. This great country that we are relies upon this America that Ronald Reagan described as the "shining city on a hill." This city is built on the beautiful marble pillars of American exceptionalism. Many of them are within the Bill of Rights:

Freedom of speech, religion, the press, and assembly, all wrapped up in the First Amendment to our Constitution;

There are property rights in the Fifth Amendment;

There is a prohibition on double jeopardy. You get to be faced by an accuser and a jury of your peers;

The States' and personal rights that are reserved in the Ninth and Tenth Amendments.

All of those are pillars of American exceptionalism. So is free enterprise capitalism.

If we had none of that, we wouldn't have the Nation we are. If you build—and I want to add to that, the core of our culture is Judeo-Christianity. We

welcome people of all religions. The foundation of the American civilization is Judeo-Christianity. Without it, we can't be the America we are either.

□ 1540

So think of this beautiful shining city on the hill—which Reagan so eloquently described for us—sitting on the beautiful marble pillars of American exceptionalism, but I can't think of that city sitting there without also thinking of an essential pillar of exceptionalism called the rule of law.

Now, if you would take a jackhammer and chisel away that marble pillar of American exceptionalism, which is freedom of speech, and destroy freedom of speech, the beautiful edifice of our shining city on the hill would crumble and fall. If you did the same thing to freedom of the press, our shining city on the hill would crumble and fall. If you took away our Second Amendment rights, which I didn't mention but which are a pillar of American exceptionalism, eventually our other freedoms would crumble and fall, and tyrants would take over. If you put people subject to double jeopardy, we wouldn't be the civilization we are, and the rule of law wouldn't mean what it does. It would crumble and fall just as it would if you destroyed the rule of law, if you have contempt for the rule of law, if the Supreme Court disregarded the rule of law, and if they ruled on interpreting their law to be their whim, their wish—not the very definition of the supreme law of the land, being our Constitution.

It is as the President so well described on March 28, 2011, before a high school here in Washington, D.C., when he was asked: Why don't you just implement the DREAM Act by executive order?

His answer was to the students who were listening: I don't have the constitutional authority to do that. You've been studying the Constitution. You students know that it's the job of the legislature to pass the laws, the job of the executive branch to enforce the laws and the job of the judicial branch to interpret the laws.

Now, that is an accurate description as should aptly come from a former adjunct professor of constitutional law at the University of Chicago. That is our President. He knew what he was talking about, and that description was consistent with his oath of office, Mr. Speaker.

The oath of office is defined within our Constitution. It's specific. It has been concluded with "so help me God" for a long time, but within that oath is also the oath to preserve and protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. In the Constitution, it requires the President of the United States—our chief executive law enforcement officer and Commander in Chief—"to take care that the laws be faithfully executed." That doesn't mean, Mr. Speaker, execute the law. That doesn't mean execute the rule of

law. That doesn't mean execute the Constitution itself. It means you take an oath, and your job is to uphold the law, to take care that the law is being faithfully executed.

The President has defied his own oath of office. He has defied the rule of law. He has defied the Constitution, and he said, I'm not going to enforce the law. I'm not going to enforce the laws that I don't like. I disagree with some of the immigration policy that has been passed by Congress and signed by one of his predecessors—in fact, signed by Bill Clinton. He is refusing to enforce those kinds of laws.

That does great damage to the Constitution, and it throws the balance of the three branches of government out of whack. Our Founding Fathers imagined that there would be competition for power and influence between the three branches of government. They envisioned it always with three branches of government—the legislative branch, the executive branch and the judicial branch.

This Congress is in article I. That means we are more the voice of the people than any other branch of government. It was the first and most important branch. They also knew that they had to have a strong chief executive—a strong President, a strong Commander in Chief. The experiences they went through in fighting a Revolutionary War with the Continental Congress told them you can't have a strong national defense without a strong Commander in Chief, so they established that. They established the balance between the legislative branch in article I and the executive branch in article II and also the balance—and, I think, to a slightly lesser degree—between the judicial branch. Think of it as a triangle.

They envisioned that each branch of government would seek to expand its power. That's human nature. You always want more power than you actually have, whether you take this thing from the Pope to the President, right on down the line to the Senators, who have a one one-hundredth of the power of the Senate Chamber, and to the House Members, who have a one four-hundred-thirty-fifth of the House Chamber. We always want to have a little more leverage, a little more influence—get your hands on a gavel or maybe become the majority leader, the minority leader, the Speaker of the House. Actually, the former Speaker of the House, Speaker PELOSI, just walked across this floor, Mr. Speaker, and she would understand that as we all do. In a family, you always want to have more influence. If the patriarch of the family is the one who writes the rules, you always grate a little bit underneath that. That's a natural thing to always try to grab a little bit more power.

They knew it was human nature, so they set up this balance between the three branches of government, but they envisioned that each branch of government would jealously protect its con-

stitutional authority and not concede it to the usurpation of some other branch of government. They envisioned that Congress would try to grow in its influence and authority, and they gave the President veto power so that he could veto the overreach, potentially, of the House and the Senate together.

They balanced the House and the Senate so that this hot cup of coffee—or hot cup of tea, they were thinking here in the House of Representatives—could be a quick reaction force when things go wrong in America. A new crop of House Members comes in with the freshest of vigor that comes from the American people, and they set about changing things. That's a 2-year election cycle. We saw that in 2010 when 87 new freshmen Republicans came into the House of Representatives—every single one of them having run for office on the promise to repeal ObamaCare, every single one. Meanwhile, while the House was being heated up, the Senate itself—which, if all of the Senators rather than roughly a third of them were up for election each cycle, I think we would have seen the majority turn over in the United States Senate, but it didn't quite do that.

So the Senate has been the cooling saucer to the hot cup of tea or coffee that is the House. Our Founding Fathers saw that, and they wanted to balance that. They wanted to have the longer view in the Senate. They wanted the quick reaction forces in the House. They wanted to blend them together, and they did. I think they did a very good job of that.

They also wanted to then check an overreach of article I, the legislative branch, the Congress, by giving the President of the United States veto power. At the same time, they put constraints on the President because we can control the activities of the executive branch through the appropriations if we can actually control the appropriations here in the House of Representatives. So they granted that authority, but they expected that there would be like a tug of war for that power. They did not think that the President of the United States would take an oath of office to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and be required to take care that the laws be faithfully executed and then go out and execute the law rather than enforce the law, but that's what has happened.

The President has with impunity defied the rule of law, and has simply canceled immigration law that existed on the books that requires ICE and Federal immigration law enforcement officers to place those individuals unlawfully here in removal proceedings. That's the law. The President suspended it.

And what has happened here in Congress?

There was an election after he did that. On March 28, 2011, he said, I don't have the power to by executive order

implement the DREAM Act. On June 15, 2012, he assumed that authority, and he simply suspended the rule of law and imposed his will, his wish, on America.

And what happened?

The people who took an oath to uphold the Constitution and the rule of law decided that they were going to honor the lawlessness. They decided that they were going to comply with the President's order because, well, their jobs were on the line, for one thing, but I say also they have an oath of office for another.

When that happens, when there is a dispute between the legislative branch and the executive branch of government, the judicial branch needs to step in to sort out that dispute. I know they don't like to do that, Mr. Speaker. In any case, I asked for a meeting and invited people to come to the table, which they did, and we discussed how we move forward to put a block on the President's unconstitutional assumption of legislative authority—a violation of the separation of powers.

□ 1550

I had been through that litigation in the past on an issue that I'll not take up here, but it had to do with a State issue and the State chief executive officer. I knew the arguments. Out of that meeting came the lawsuit of *Crane v. Napolitano*. That's Chris Crane, the president of the ICE union as the lead plaintiff. Of course, now Napolitano is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano. That case went before the Northern District of Texas, the Federal court, where Judge Reed O'Connor ruled in favor of the plaintiffs—that's the ICE union and the list of plaintiffs that are there—ruled in favor of it in nine of 10 arguments and sent the other argument back to the executive branch to reword it in such a way—I'll just use my terms, Mr. Speaker—it's more intelligible so he can answer and respond on that particular point.

Generally, the decision was this: Judge Reed O'Connor essentially wrote: shall means shall, not may. If it requires that the agents put people that are unlawfully present in the United States in removal proceedings, if it says they "shall do so," then they shall do so. Shall means shall. It doesn't mean may. And there is no word in our language that is more definitive that can replace the word shall, at least as far as legal parlance is concerned. That's essentially the decision.

So it seems to be—and I'm optimistic that it's moving in the direction—that we will get a final decision in a Federal court and perhaps the administration will appeal this all the way up the line to the Supreme Court.

But in the end, I can't imagine how a judicial branch of government, how a Supreme Court could come down on the side of the President and decide that the President of the United States has

the authority to make up law as he goes along or disregard law as he goes along.

The President has argued—at least the President and his spokesmen and spokeswomen have argued—that they have prosecutorial discretion. Prosecutorial discretion means that they can't enforce the law against every person who might violate the law because they don't have the resources, so the resources need to be targeted where they do the most good. That's prosecutorial discretion.

I agree that that exists and that it's necessary that the discretion of prosecution exists. But I don't agree that the President can define broad classes of people that include hundreds of thousands in a single class and then decide that he's not going to enforce the law against any of them. That is what he has done. He's manufactured four classes of people and decided he's going to waive the law on all of these classes of people, suspend its enforcement. That turns out to be an invitation to more and more people to violate the law, even "to the extent of."

We have had illegal aliens in the halls of the congressional offices that have lobbied Members of Congress with impunity. And they will come in boldly and say, I'm exempted from the law by the President of the United States, so I can be here. And I demand that you agree with me and get me my college education. They have been inside the Judiciary Committee room. They have been introduced by the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. That's how far this has gotten, Mr. Speaker. The contempt for the law, the contempt for the rule of law and the sense of entitlement have gone beyond the pale.

So this rule of law, which must be reconstructed now, because the verbal and keyboard jackhammers of the left have chiseled away at that beautiful marble pillar of American exceptionalism called the rule of law. And because they have done that, we must reconstruct it. And if we can't hold the rule of law together, if we can't restore it, if we can't reconstruct it, then it crumbles. If the rule of law, according to the Gang of Eight's bill in the Senate, according to some of what seems to be moving here in the House, destroys the rule of law at least with regard to immigration, it destroys it.

There would be no enforcement of the rule of law with regard to immigration unless you committed a felony. You're here unlawfully, you commit a felony or you commit a combination of three mysterious misdemeanors, that happens to qualify you for removal proceedings. Those are exemptions that are part of it. They claim that they will enforce the law on that.

The balance of it is if you cross the border illegally and come into the United States, that is a crime, Mr. Speaker. If you overstay your visa, which is about, let's say, a number that approaches 40 percent of those who are

unlawfully present in the United States, that's a civil misdemeanor, not a crime, at least today. If you do either one of those things only, they're not going to put you in removal proceedings. And if you come across into the United States and you defraud your employer and you come up with fraudulent documents and you use that in order to get a job, this administration isn't going to enforce document fraud, which is a felony against you.

Essentially it said if you can get into the United States legally or illegally, if you can stay in the United States, you can cheat to get a job, you can lie to your employer, you can use document fraud and there won't be a penalty to any of these things. Essentially, nonviolent, peaceful crimes are not going to be a problem. But if you get engaged in some of the serious things like maybe drug smuggling or the crimes of violence that we all know about or the threat of violence even, then it makes the administration uncomfortable, and they might decide to send you back and put you in the condition that you were in before you broke the law.

But peaceful people have been granted amnesty by the President of the United States. And this Congress has sat here almost placidly and accepted it as if he has that constitutional authority, and he does not. That's why the lawsuit of *Crane v. Napolitano* was filed, and it's a clear understanding from my standpoint. But the confusion seems to be that too many Members that take an oath of office to preserve, protect, and defend this Constitution, as well, don't have a clear enough understanding of the brighter line between article I and article II.

Our job is to legislate, write the laws. The President's job is to enforce them. It's that simple. Yet there was an interpretation that came out to us on the morning of November 7. Wednesday morning, November 7, Mr. Speaker—and a lot of people will understand and remember what that date was. That was the day after the election.

I was engaged in this election as much as I've been engaged in any election. And as a Member of Congress from Iowa, I was also engaged in the Presidential nomination and election process. I was engaged in the debate. And I've done events that have to do with Presidential candidates on a relatively regular basis. I think I understood what the debate was about for the election for President of the United States.

As I listened to that, it was about jobs and the economy. If you would put jobs and the economy in quotes and then put Barack Obama's name in the search engine of Google, or if you would put jobs and the economy in quotes and then put Romney or Mitt there in the search engine of Google and send that off, you're going to get hundreds of thousands of hits altogether because that was the topic of the election last November 6, jobs and

the economy. I told the Romney people I've heard "jobs and the economy" so many times it puts me to sleep. Don't you think you're putting the American people to sleep by beating the same drum over and over again?

But remembering the mantra jobs and the economy until we were just drubbed into numbness with it also reminds us that the election was not, Mr. Speaker, about the immigration issue. I don't remember a debate between Barack Obama and Mitt Romney that went into any depth or substance on the immigration issue. Yet before the sun came up on November 7, some of the leading pundits and experts concluded that Mitt Romney would be President-elect by now before the sun came up on November 7 if he just hadn't said the two words "self-deport," or if he had not been such a defender of the rule of law on immigration.

That was a surprise to me. I wish he'd have talked about it more. Well, he didn't. The election wasn't about immigration, but talking heads and, let me say, erroneously pragmatic individuals in my party who decided that they would contribute to this argument that came from both parties. And they drove the argument to the point where some people were convinced the election really was about immigration when it was not. And they argued that Mitt Romney would be President-elect if he had just gotten a larger percentage of the Hispanic vote.

He would not, Mr. Speaker. If he had won the majority of the Hispanic vote in the swing States, he still would not have won the Presidency. If he had won 70 percent, he might have; but that didn't happen. And no one really thinks that's going to happen in the near future. So they came to a conclusion and thought they could support it with facts. They've learned now that they can't support their conclusion with facts, but they're determined to go forward with granting amnesty to initially—they think—11 million people that are here in this country unlawfully while providing the emptiest and most vacuous of promises that one day they're going to get around to putting a plan together, and if the plan happens to be implemented they might secure the border.

□ 1600

That's what's going on. And I don't know how in the world they can say this to the American people with a straight face and believe that there's going to be border security in exchange for law enforcement. It's not going to happen, Mr. Speaker. It didn't happen in 1986, one of only two times that Ronald Reagan let me down.

But in 1986, the promise was this:

We had about a million people in the country illegally. Actually, it started at 700,000 to 800,000. That sounds like a minuscule number today. So roughly a million people, and debate raged in the House and the Senate. I believed all

along that good sense would prevail. I believed that people who gave their oath to uphold the Constitution in the House and in the Senate would understand that they were undermining the rule of law if they granted amnesty to people who came into America illegally. I believed all along that they would understand that if they grant amnesty, they would get more lawbreakers, more illegal border crossers, a less manageable situation than the one that they had in 1986.

But the argument for clemency, for amnesty prevailed in the House and the Senate. But I believe that Ronald Reagan would understand the principles of rule of law clearly enough and the long-term implications of such an act of amnesty in 1986 clearly enough that he would take the authority that was vested in him and the United States Congress to veto that legislation and require the Congress to pass amnesty by a two-thirds majority in the House and Senate and overturn his veto. I don't believe they could have done that in 1986.

I believed Ronald Reagan would veto the Amnesty Act in 1986. Instead, to my great disappointment, he signed it. The calculation at the time was, if we just grant amnesty to these million people, we're going to get full cooperation to enforce the border and never again will there be another Amnesty Act—never again. This was the Amnesty Act to end all Amnesty Acts. It was going to be law enforcement from that point forward. The border was going to be secured. There would be a clear prohibition on hiring illegal employees. They were going to shut off the jobs magnet, and they created the I-9 form, the I-9 form which requires an employer to fill out the form, make sure that you have the documentation, the identification, and make sure that you have all of the 'I's' dotted and the 'T's' crossed on the I-9 form because a Federal agent is going to come inspect your paperwork. An INS agent would come and inspect your paperwork.

I did all of those things as carefully as I could. I had a fear that I would slip up and not meet the standard, Mr. Speaker. And so we very carefully documented our job applicants in my construction company to make sure that we were in compliance with the law, all the while expecting that that INS agent was just around the corner taking a look at the paperwork of our competition or our neighboring business. Of course, they never showed up to check my paperwork. I'm not disappointed by that. I'm disappointed that they didn't show up to check the paperwork of thousands of employers with millions of employees.

The enforcement didn't really happen. It didn't happen in shutting off the jobs magnet. The litigation began. The ACLU began litigating, as did other organizations. They began to argue, You're requiring an employer to make a judgment call when he looks at the documents and the picture and the

face of the person that's applying. And you cannot require an employer to make a judgment call because it makes them liable for the lawsuit that we're going to sue them with.

So the litigation of immigration turned it into a mess, intentionally, I believe, so that they could provide for open borders, which was the intention of the Teddy Kennedys and others at the time. They undermined the enforcement effort politically. And they undermined it in the courts, and they undermined it culturally, and they began to convert the people who came here illegally into a victims' group.

If you understand the politics of victimology, you understand that there is a certain amount of sainthood that gets attached to these victims, for people that are in victims' groups. That conversion has been taking place since probably before 1986, but I remember it from that point forward.

What Ronald Reagan learned and what today his Attorney General at the time, Attorney General Ed Meese knows and has three times written about, and what another member of the Reagan administration, Gary Bauer, knows and has spoken openly of is that if you grant amnesty, if you suspend the rule of law and you tell people, We're not going to enforce the law against you, continue to break it, you'll get more law breakers.

More law breakers means more lawlessness, and more lawlessness erodes the rule of law. And when they bring a bill to the Senate that legalizes, aside from the felons, the three mysterious misdemeanor committers, aside from that, it legalizes everybody here in the United States that's here illegally. Not only that, they send an invitation by the bill out to anybody that has been deported in the past that says: Re-apply. Come back into the United States. We really didn't mean it.

They say if you came here after December 31, 2011, you're not going to be exempted by this Amnesty Act that is coming through the Senate, so presumably they are going to enforce the law against those who came here after December 31, 2011.

Mr. Speaker, they're not going to do that. If they were going to do that, you would see a news story about somebody who was put back and the condition they were in before they broke the law that came here after December 31, 2011. No, ICE is prohibited from enforcing the law against people who fit these definitions, and I asked that specific question of the president of the ICE union before the Judiciary Committee under oath. And he said, If they're in jail, I can't put them in removal proceedings.

Even if they're in jail, he can't go into jail and say, Listen, I'm required to put you in removal proceedings. I'm going to take you back to the port of entry. He can't do that.

Who's in handcuffs now? ICE, the Border Patrol, in handcuffs today. They can't enforce the law the way it's

written in even the 1986 Amnesty Act, let alone the 1996 Immigration Reform Act of which LAMAR SMITH of Texas had such a huge role in. Good legislation; glad they did it. 1986 was flawed; it should have never been passed.

But if ICE can't enforce the law today, even if someone is in jail, and they are essentially handcuffed from doing their job, and there is a legalization of the people that came into the United States before December 31, 2011, and an invitation to those who have since been removed to come back again, and no prospect that they're going to enforce the law against those who come in after December 31, 2011, that makes it, Mr. Speaker, the always is, always was, and always will be Amnesty Act.

I use a little bit of, let me say, license here to speak of it this way: always is, always was, and always will be. If you is in America, you gets to stay. If you was in America, you gets to come back. And if you will be in America, you also get to stay.

This is the perpetual and retroactive Amnesty Act. It's perpetual; it goes on forever. You could never enforce immigration law again. You could never say to people, Well, you came here after our deadline; now we're going to enforce the law.

Not after you flow 11 million or 22 million or 33 million people into this country, or a number that results from this that may perhaps be over 50 million people over time. Numbers USA's number is 33 million people that get legalized as an effect of the legislation in the Senate.

Robert Rector's study at the Heritage Foundation—and both of them, by the way, did stellar work yesterday. His study only contemplates 11.5 million, which is the lowest number, the reduced number, the boiled-down number of those we know are here that essentially reflects off the United States census. That's the people that admit they're here when you ask them, Are you here illegally? A number approaching 11 million said, Yes, I am. I confess.

We know that in the '86 Amnesty Act that was roughly a million people anticipated. It became over 3 million people. So use the three-to-one multiplier. That does reflect pretty close. It's not the formula used by Numbers USA. That formula is a careful formula that calculates family unification and the record we have of human activity on how they react to the legislative changes that take place.

But if the formula was 1 million in '86, it became 3 million because of document fraud and other reasons. Those who gamed the system, those who came in before the Amnesty Act was signed, or even after the Amnesty Act was signed, to take part in that and lied about when they came here, the 1 million became 3 million. It doesn't stretch my imagination to see the 11 million become 33 million. That seems to me to match up in two different types of formulas.

□ 1610

So do we really want to legalize 33 million people, or even 11 million people?

Do we want to give them access to all of the government benefits that we have?

Do we want to let them have access immediately to, I'd say, at least to and their children to the systems that we have, the health care system, the education system we have, the public security systems we have?

Do we want to put them in a place where their tax return makes them eligible for the Earned Income Tax Credit, so that all of their children that may not live in the United States even at the time, they get a check from the Federal Treasury for that?

Do we want to see this pour out to where the number that came from Robert Rector's study is that, on average, the people that would be included in this amnesty act in the Senate, over the course of the time they would live in the United States, the average comes in at 34 years old, and a 34-year old, by the time they reach that age, will live to the age of about 84. That's 50 years in the United States. That's a net cost to the taxpayer of \$580,000 per person.

Do we want to really write a check or borrow the money from the Chinese to fund that?

Do we need that many more people in the United States doing the work they say Americans won't do, for a price of \$580,000 per person?

Do we want to rent cheap labor for the price of \$12,000 a year? That's what the math works out to. I think it's \$11,600 a year.

Do we really want to—do the taxpayers care that much about having somebody to cut the grass and somebody to weed the garden and somebody to do all this work that they claim Americans won't do?

By the way, I don't think anybody in this Congress can find work that I haven't been willing to do, and I think my sons would certainly reinforce that statement. They remind me that they've been out in 126-degree heat index and poured concrete on these days, and they've been driving sheet piling across the swamp at 60 below wind chill. They tell me that's a 186 degrees temperature change, and no species on the planet could survive what they went through growing up in our family. And I say, well, no species other than my sons. And I remind them that, and me too, guys.

We did work like that in the heat, in the cold, in the rain and the snow. We did work underground. We do the sanitary sewer work. We do earth work. We do all kinds of things. We do demolition. All of the work that they say Americans won't do, we've done a whole lot of that and will do more.

No one's too proud to do work in this country. We're just sometimes not willing to do work for the price that's offered. And we know that free enter-

prise capitalism takes us to this. The value of anything, including labor, is determined by the supply and demand in the marketplace.

Corn prices go up and down, depending on how much there is, how much corn there is, the supply, and how many customers there are to buy it, the demand. That's true for gold and oil and platinum and soybeans and labor.

And because we have an oversupply of unskilled labor, and underskilled labor is why we have such low wages and benefits at low- and unskilled labor. The highest unemployment's in the lowest of skills.

And yet people in this Congress think you have to expand the low-skilled labor numbers, bring people in, low- and unskilled, Senate version of the bill, seven unskilled people and under-educated people, for every one that's going to be able to pay their going rate on what it costs to sustain them in society.

For every person that would come in under the Senate bill, that would pay as much or more in taxes as they draw down in government benefits, there are seven who will not be able to do that.

The universe of those in the 11 million people cannot sustain themselves in this society that we have, not in a single year of their projected existence in this culture, in this society, in this economy. So why would we do that?

Why, if we need more people to pull on the oars, would we allow 100 million Americans, that are of working age and simply not in the work force, to sit up there in steerage, while we bring people on board to pull the oars and wait on the people sitting in steerage?

That defies any kind of rational logic, Mr. Speaker.

So to destroy the rule of law, to, I'll say, subsidize a non-work ethic, and now it turns into three generations of Americans that are drawing down some of the 80 different means-tested welfare programs, it is foolish for us to consider such a proposal. And I'm hopeful that the good sense of the American people can do something about the spell that has been cast over too many Republicans in the House and the Senate.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I urge the American people to save this Congress from themselves and restore the rule of law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the Speaker of the House, not the presiding officer at the moment, but the Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER, made some irresponsible remarks about climate change. He was asked about the reports that the President is

prepared to act to protect the planet and future generations from climate change impacts.

And here's what the Speaker had to say:

I think this is absolutely crazy. Why would you want to increase the cost of energy and kill more American jobs at a time when the American people are still asking, where are the jobs? Clear enough.

Well, I could not disagree more strongly with Speaker BOEHNER. Presidential action to protect the climate and future generations is absolutely essential. The House is controlled by leaders who deny the science and are recklessly ignoring the risks of a rapidly changing climate.

The House has become the last refuge of the Flat Earth Society. That is why the President must act, using his existing authorities under the law.

The Speaker's assertion that acting to reduce emissions will hurt the economy is absolutely wrong. We need to act to lead the world in the clean energy economy of the future. If we don't act, initiative, leadership, and economic growth will go to countries that do.

Now, I've been in Congress for over three decades. I worked on the Clean Air Act reauthorization of 1990. I remember the testimony we received in the 1980s about how, if we tried to do more in the environmental area, we would lose our jobs and our economy would be set back. We would face another depression.

Well, on a bipartisan basis, we adopted the Clean Air Act. We had the bill sponsored and signed by President George H.W. Bush, and that legislation led to accomplishments of reducing air pollution in some of our heavily polluted urban areas, including my own home of Los Angeles.

We were able to stop the ravages of acid rain, which were causing destruction of our forests and rivers and ponds in the Northeast and in Canada. We were able to do something about toxic pollution, which was causing birth defects and cancer in large numbers of people who lived near industrial facilities. And we were able to get legislation passed and moved forward to stop the destruction of the upper ozone of our planet.

We accomplished these goals because we didn't pay attention to the naysayers who told us our economy would be ruined, we would lose jobs, we should forget about a healthy environment, we should forget about pristine air in our national parks.

Luckily, we had leadership, from Republicans and Democrats, to do something, and we can now talk about the great accomplishments that we achieved. And at the same time, we created more jobs. We created more industries. We created new technological developments.

But let me talk about why the President needs to act on this question of climate change. On Monday, the International Energy Agency, IEA, released

a report concluding that the world is not on track to meet the goal of limiting global average temperatures below 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit, or 2 degrees Celsius.

Now, that is a tremendous concern because the scientists are telling us that if we don't achieve the goal of reducing the temperature rise, we are going to see some very severe impacts: flooding of our coastal cities, increased risk to our food supply, unprecedented heat waves, exacerbated water scarcity in many regions, increased frequency of high-intensity tropical cyclones, irreversible loss of biodiversity, including coral reefs.

□ 1620

Recognizing this danger, our country and other countries around the world joined together in 2010 and said that we've got to do what we can to keep the temperature rise below 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit. The IEA concluded that the world is failing to meet this goal. Greenhouse gas emissions are driving climate change, and it's happening with increasing rapidity. So can we just deny this is happening? Can we say, oh, it will cost jobs and we shouldn't pay any attention to it?

On our committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over this whole question, the Democratic leaders on the committee have asked that we have hearings to bring in the scientists because some of our Republican members have said they don't believe in the science. We sent over 36 letters asking that the scientists be brought before the committee to tell us why they think these terrible things may happen, and we have never gotten a response from a single letter of request for hearings.

Can you imagine the people running the Congress denying the scientists and then refusing to hear from the scientists or claiming the science is uncertain and not resolved and then refusing to hear from scientists who can come in and talk about what they have learned?

Now, if we're facing a world where all the accumulated greenhouse gases stay in that atmosphere and to the point where our planet is heating up and we're facing terrible consequences, you don't have to buy everything they say, but what are the chances that they're right? Ten percent? Would we take the risk that we're going to face a 10 percent chance of all these catastrophic consequences and do nothing about it? Well, that seems to be what the Republican leaders are saying, including the primary leader of the House, the Speaker.

Now, let's look at some other more recent examples. When the President announced historic fuel economy standards, critics said cars would get smaller and more expensive, and it would hurt the sales of our automobiles. Well, they were completely wrong. Vehicle sales are booming. They are at high levels now. Consumers are

saving money because cars are more fuel efficient. This is an accomplishment—an accomplishment—despite all the naysayers. When the Obama administration issued mercury standards for power plants and other sources, House Republicans said it would cost jobs and raise electricity prices.

Well, that hasn't happened. Implementation has gone smoothly, and electricity prices have not gone up. In fact, wholesale prices actually went down, and there have been no rolling blackouts as predicted by the doomsday scenarios.

In 2011, the EPA issued a report on the benefits of the Clean Air Act over the period from 1990 to 2020. According to the study, the direct benefits of the Clean Air Act in the form of cleaner air and a healthier population, more productive Americans, are estimated to reach nearly \$2 trillion in the year 2020. We're talking about saving money by protecting our environment.

So when the Speaker says that we shouldn't pay attention and that it's crazy to pay attention to the concerns about climate change, he's absolutely wrong. When he says action to reduce carbon emissions would harm the economy, just the opposite will happen. We will create new clean energy businesses and more economic growth.

The President has said that if Congress won't act, he must act; and he is absolutely right. The President must act, and he has the authority to act under existing laws. Congress will not act because the leadership of the House of Representatives denies reality. They want to politicize science. They want to politicize science by ignoring it. Well, science is not another political opinion. Science is looking at the evidence. Turn on the television news any day of the week, and you will hear stories about droughts, superstorms, new hurricanes, new climate events, and new record levels of temperatures. Don't we think that something might be happening and that we have some responsibility in government to try to do something about this issue?

Addressing climate change will require actions over the long term, but the IEA report highlights four policies that can be implemented now and through 2020 at no economic cost, policies that will help reduce local air pollution and increase energy security.

First, that report recommended that countries adopt specific energy-efficiency measures. We don't have to build new power plants if we use our energy resources more efficiently. We can have more efficient heating and cooling systems in residential and commercial buildings, more efficient appliances and lighting in residential and commercial buildings. Energy-efficiency measures can account for half of the emissions reductions that the report proposes through the year 2020.

Secondly, the report said that if countries limit the construction and use of inefficient subcritical coal-fired power plants and switch instead to

cleaner and more efficient plants, we will see the air get cleaner and the threat from climate change be dramatically reduced.

Thirdly, the report recommended that countries reduce emissions of methane, a potent greenhouse gas from upstream oil and gas production, by installing readily available technologies in the short term and pursuing additional long-term reduction strategies.

And, fourth, the report proposed that countries accelerate the phase-out of fossil fuel subsidies which exacerbate climate change by encouraging consumption of carbon pollution emitting energy. Why are we subsidizing the oil companies with special tax breaks? Is a tax break for an oil company any different from appropriations of dollars for the oil companies? They're doing very well on their own.

What we need to do is to provide a level playing field for competition for renewable fuels, alternatives and efficiency. These are the things that we ought to be focusing on rather than keeping oil and coal the predominant sources of our energy for electricity and fueling our motor vehicles.

Things are changing. They're changing because investors don't want to buy into stranded investments because they know climate change is happening. The American people are getting a clear sense that something is happening in the climate, but they don't hear Congress even talking about it. And around the world, others are moving forward. Why should we allow others, whether it's the Chinese or the Europeans, to develop the technologies? We have always been the leader in developing technologies for the future. We developed the catalytic converter to control pollution from automobiles. We invented the scrubbers that could be used on power plants to reduce the emissions that come from these power plants. We have made all these advances over the years because we've given a clear incentive for anti-pollution control devices because we wanted to reduce pollution, and now we have a Congress where they want to deny at the highest levels of leadership in this Congress that climate change exists and the President shouldn't take any action.

Imagine the top leader of the House of Representatives saying:

I think it's absolutely crazy. Why would you want to increase the cost of energy and kill more American jobs at a time when the American people are still asking, where are the jobs?

□ 1630

Well, the jobs can come along with efforts to reduce pollution. We have always seen the economy and our protection of the environment go hand in hand. We shouldn't say that we have to choose. We can have both. We have a long history in this country of bipartisan support for the proposition and the reality that we can preserve the environment and protect our economy

and prosper, if we are willing to adopt policies and show some leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when the compliance costs were being thought of, when we were trying to deal with the acid rain problem. Industry after industry on the record—and it's all available to review—claimed the costs would be enormous. Then when we passed the law, the actual costs were a small fraction of what was being predicted. When they were told that they had to accomplish the goal under a cap-and-trade program to reduce sulfur emissions that were causing acid rain, we accomplished the goal at a fraction of the original estimates—which I think were highly inflated for scare purposes—but we accomplished the goal because we said this is the goal, accomplish that goal. You can benefit from new technologies and new ways to accomplish our environmental objectives. And that's exactly what we did, we moved out with the acid rain pollution problem.

So my colleagues and Mr. Speaker, let's not have leaders who say we have to say that we're going to ignore the threat from climate change in order to protect jobs. We can protect and promote jobs and protect our environment at the same time.

And Mr. President, you were so right when you said if the Congress will not act, you must act, you must lead. We are looking to the President to show that leadership because we're not going to get it from this House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE DISPOSITION OF RUSSIAN HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-38)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the emergency declared in Executive Order 13617 of June 25, 2012, with respect to the disposition of Russian highly enriched uranium is to continue in effect beyond June 25, 2013.

The risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile mate-

rial in the territory of the Russian Federation continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13617 with respect to the disposition of Russian highly enriched uranium.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE June 20, 2013.

WEEK IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, today we did vote on the farm bill, as it's been referred to, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act. But as some of us have pointed out—and I attempted to establish through an amendment—this was not a farm bill. Eighty percent was about food stamps.

It was a very brilliant move by Members of Congress back when the Democrats controlled the majority—the seventies, the eighties—in fact, after Vietnam, the post-Watergate era, the most liberal Congress until Speaker PELOSI took the gavel. They did a brilliant thing. They were able to take so much in the form of welfare, public assistance of all kinds, and put it into so many different budgets under the jurisdiction of different committees so that if at any one time someone went after one area that was multiplicitous, it was simply a duplication of other agencies' funds, then they could be marginalized and demeaned and have it said, you don't care about women or veterans or children or the poor, or whatever. It's worked well, in fact, to the point that we now obviously have about \$17 trillion in debt more than we've had revenue coming in. Basically, we would be, perhaps, Greece or Cyprus, other countries that are basically on the verge of bankruptcy except that we produce our own money. And the dollar is the international currency, so it's allowed all this reckless overspending.

So I think it's time—and I know there are many others that agree—that we reform Congress to the point where all public assistance comes in one single committee, one area where all public assistance can be located. It will be easy to see all the duplications, all the waste, so much easier to see areas where fraud is running rampant when you put all of those public assistance measures in the same bill.

I actually proposed an amendment that would strike title IV—which was the food stamp program, although it's been cleverly renamed the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP—has a real snap to it. But the goal was not to do away with that program. In fact, my friend across the aisle, Mr. MCGOVERN, asked me: Are you wanting to do away entirely with

the food stamp or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program? And I replied before the Rules Committee, on the record, before a television camera, into a microphone, no, I didn't want to do away with that program. But I did feel it needed to have its own time, its own discussion, and not be 80 percent of a farm bill.

But what is really heartbreaking is not that children are not going to have food in America—because whether we bring a farm bill back that separates out the food stamp program so we can deal with that separately—not do away with it, but deal with it separately—or whether it comes back and we're into the rut of continuing to extend and extend, children will not be allowed to go hungry.

But I think back about the Presidential campaign last year and about how much the politics around here has degenerated, such that when a Republican like Mitt Romney—or JOHN MCCAIN, back in 2008—says I disagree with my friend, my opponent, but I know he's a good man and he has a good heart. He wants to do good things for the country, we just disagree with how to get there. And yet what we have coming back, as Mitt Romney saw, was Mitt Romney, after saying he's a good man, a good family man, but I think he's wrong on these issues, what came back from the drones—the human drones that were speaking on behalf of the President—was, gee, he wants to push people off a cliff; he wants people to die of cancer; he wants them to get cancer. He's obviously painted as a very evil man.

□ 1640

That came back to mind today during some of the discussions. I heard our friend from Maryland, minority whip here, talking about the farm bill, blaming Republicans for not being bipartisan when three-fourths of the Republicans had voted for the farm bill. Yet our friends across the aisle did make it a very partisan measure, and not only made it partisan in the rhetoric condemning Republicans for not reaching out, things were said in the subsequent discussions when my friend from Texas had been here on the House floor, but comments from friends across the aisle like children were crying out here for food and Republicans, in essence, not only voted down their help but wanted to slap them down.

I would never say that about a friend across the aisle. I think they're wrong in the way they want to spend so much more money than we have coming in it's bankrupting the country. I would never think for a moment that one of my friends from across the aisle wanted to slap down children. I just wouldn't bring myself to say that because I know it's not true. I think they're very wrongheaded on so many issues. But comments like taking not

only food, but their utensils or table and just leave them with the floor, how could we do such a thing?

Yet, when we look at the food stamp bill that had 20 percent farm in it that did not pass today, it certainly wasn't for a lack of work by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, FRANK LUCAS. Chairman LUCAS and I don't always agree on things, but I know that man and he is a good man, and I did appreciate hearing Mr. HOYER commenting as much. FRANK LUCAS worked very, very hard on this bill and he actually got reforms in here.

There were actually amendments passed that some didn't like, but it was a bipartisan bill. There were some Democrats that voted for this bill. That makes it bipartisan. Not like ObamaCare that was rammed down the throats of Americans and the Republicans, without having input, without having any opportunity for amendment really, just forced upon Republicans in the country.

In fact, there's never been a Congress that has been as closed to amendment, as closed to input from the other side, as we witnessed when the Democrats took the majority in January of 2007 until they lost the majority in November of 2010. Those years saw more closed rules, no amendments possible. It was unbelievable the way our friends across the aisle were so abusive with the process and preventing almost half of the country from having any voice in anything that went on.

When I hear our friends across the aisle talk about a lack of bipartisanship, it's a little difficult. What really is a bit heartbreaking is to hear people across the aisle speak so eloquently as I sat here listening today, hearing people speak with such incredibly persuasive words and expressions and with such venom and passion that, if I did not know the truth, I actually would be believing how horrible and evil and nasty and child hating Republicans really are.

However, I know people on this side of the aisle as well. There is not anybody that has been elected to Congress—there's no other way to get to the House. There is nobody that's been elected on either side of the aisle that wants to see a child suffer because of anything we do. It is very offensive to have people on one side of the aisle attribute those kinds of feelings that we wanted to hurt children. Really? It sounds so real and so true.

How can we ever have legitimate debate in this House of Representatives when anybody can stand and attribute such evil motivation on the side of the other and make it sound so real? Do we have any chance of saving this country when people can come to the floor and make such ridiculous allegations sound so persuasive and true? You can't have debate like that.

On the other hand, I have looked in the eyes of constituents of mine. As I go all over my district, down to a wonderful little community, it brought us

recently for a town hall. I go all over the district. One of the things that really makes me proud is to be introduced as having been to some community more than any other Member of Congress. They thought, Oh, well, he is from Tyler. He wouldn't care about us here. I care about the whole district. I know all of the people that are elected, they do care about their district.

But when I look into the eyes of constituents who want to provide for their children, they want them to have the best that they can provide for them, and they talk about standing in line—I've heard this story so many times from people who are brokenhearted about it and sometimes get angry just thinking about what they've seen and what they've heard.

But standing in line at a grocery store behind people with a food stamp card, and they look in their basket—as one individual said, I love crab legs, you know, the big king crab legs. I love those. But we haven't been able to have them in our house since who knows when. But I'm standing behind a guy who has those in his basket and I'm looking longingly, like, When can I ever make enough again where our family can have something like that, and then sees the food stamp card pulled out and provided. He looks at the king crab legs and looks at his ground meat and realizes, because he does pay income tax, he doesn't get more back than he pays in, he is actually helping pay for the king crab legs when he can't pay for them for himself.

People across the aisle want to condemn anyone who is working and scraping and can't save any money and is trying to decide how in the world do we ever get ahead, can we ever get ahead. They're cutting back my hours at work. We're doing the best we can, and yet I stand in line and see multiple people paying with food stamp cards for things I cannot afford.

How can you begrudge somebody who feels that way? How can you begrudge anyone who steps up on behalf of constituents who feel that way? We don't want anyone to go hungry. And from the amount of obesity in this country by people we are told do not have enough to eat, it does seem like we could have a debate about this issue without allegations about wanting to slap down or starve children.

Because when I think of children, I think about those also who are growing up right now. They have no say in the amount of money we're spending in this Chamber right here, billions and billions and billions, with so much waste, fraud, and abuse.

□ 1650

Yet those very little children who have no voice in what we're doing are going to have to pay for our extravagance and our waste and our fraud and abuse. What kind of parent would want that? I don't know of anybody on either side of the aisle who would want that, but it is what we are producing.

I didn't vote for the farm bill—because it's not a farm bill. I believe we need to have a debate where we bring all the public assistance into one place so we see what's there and so we can cut out as much waste, fraud and abuse as possible, where we can make those cuts, because when we're spending the billions and billions and billions we are for food supplement, whatever you want to call it, and when there is story after story of people who are caught selling interest in their food stamp cards or what they buy with their food stamp cards, can we really not come and have a discussion about how we can quit putting a heavier and heavier burden on children who have no voice in this Congress?

Can we not have a debate and a discussion without demonizing people who say, Look, I care about the children who are growing up and who are going to be born and who shouldn't have to pay for the extravagance and the narcissism within this generation? Can't we have that discussion without demonizing one another? I would hope that we could get to that point.

One comment about Tea Party extremism killing the farm bill. When a small reform is made to the food stamp program and when this additional requirement is added that, for those who are able to work, they will need to work, is that evil and mean and just so totally in disregard of those who are "getting" from everyone else?

We heard this when Congress wasn't a blip on my radar. We heard this over and over as Newt Gingrich and the new Republican majority after 40 years or so came into this body as the majority, and they said, We are going to reform welfare—and they did. President Clinton didn't want it. He fought it tooth and nail. Just like the balanced budgets, he fought it, he fought it—and he used his veto more than once—but finally, it's signed into law. When it's clear to President Clinton that there are votes here in a bipartisan way to override his veto, he might as well sign it. Now, today, how wonderful it is when he extols the virtues of his two terms as President—the virtues of what the Republican majority did when they finally reined things in.

Now, I was told as a freshman and as a very staunch conservative, don't even bother to go to the Harvard orientation for new Members of Congress because it's just so liberal. They vilify those of us who think like we do in that we need to be more conservative in our spending, but I went anyway as I enjoy a good debate, and we had several. I was struck, even at the liberal Harvard Law School, where they've totally forgotten the reason for their founding and of what was required of students in those early days as they prepared them to live a life in total submission to their savior Jesus Christ. It's amazing when you go back and read the things that the students were taught and what they had to take an oath to believe, but they're at Harvard.

We had a dean come in with charts, who explained, ever since the Great Society legislation in the sixties—I know some think maybe it was born out of less than noble ideas, but I believe it was born out of the best of intentions. They saw people needing help, so let's give them money, let's give them help. Gee, there were deadbeat dads around the country, so let's give the single moms a check for every child they have out of wedlock. Back then, when there was between 6 and 7 percent single moms who were struggling to get by, over the years, we have paid for more and more children out of wedlock. As philosophers have said, if you pay for some activity, you're going to get more of that activity. Now in this country we are getting what we've paid for.

We are past 40 percent single moms and are on our way to 50 percent, in large part, I think, because this Congress decided—well-intentioned—to try to help single moms instead of trying to help them reach their God-given potential. Maybe help them with daycare. Get back in high school. Finish high school. You can earn so much more if you finish high school than if you never do. Get a little college, and you'll make more. That's what the statistics tell us. If we care about the people, why wouldn't we want to push them?

These charts from this dean at Harvard showed that, since the Great Society legislation, a single mom's income when adjusted for inflation for about 30 years was a flat line. Single moms on average did not ever improve their situations.

Then along came what was portrayed as being these evil Republican Congressmen and Senators who said, We're going to reform welfare. We're going to require people to work who can. They pushed people out of being on the dole of the Federal Government, and they pushed them into starting to pursue their God-given potential and what they could do for themselves and to feel good about themselves because they're providing for themselves.

He pulled out a chart to show a single mother's income when adjusted for inflation and after welfare reform—when people were forced to work, they could—and wow. For the first time in about 30 years, a single mom's income went up when adjusted for inflation.

So who cared more—those who said, You Republicans are evil for trying to make people work who are getting child support from the government or are getting welfare? How evil you are. Are they in the more virtuous position? Or those who say, I know this will work. I know every human being has potential that God put there, and we want them to move toward that. We do not want to pay them to be a couch potato and to pay them to keep having children out of wedlock and to pay them for not pursuing what they're capable of pursuing for themselves and that wonderful feeling when you ac-

complish something for yourself? Who is more virtuous in that situation?

I can tell you, from the rhetoric, that my friends on the Democratic side were the virtuous ones and that the Republicans were the evil, mean-spirited, self-involved people because they wanted single moms to reach their potential and make more money—and it happened just like that. So then President Obama comes in, and what does he do? Right off the bat, he wants to eliminate the work requirement. I think he was motivated out of good intentions, but we're back to where we were.

We want for the people who have been getting food stamps, if they can work, to work. Let's push people toward reaching their potential. That's not evil. That's a good thing. People are also free to worship whoever, whatever or no one if they wish in America, but there are those who say, Well, gee, you're a Christian. The Christian thing is to give people money if they need it.

□ 1700

In Romans 13, it talks about the government is supposed to be an encourager of good conduct. An encourager, it would seem, to reach your potential, not to kill your potential. To encourage people to reach for the stars, not kill a NASA program and force people to teach to a test.

If we want to keep having a country that is worthy of so many places around the world trying any way they can to get into this country, then we must protect this country. That's what our oath involves: protect the country so it's not overwhelmed. Prevent this country from becoming one massive welfare state, but encourage the greatness in people.

We're not going to help that when we see a leader of a country like Syria, an Assad, who has killed so many people, who we would not want to support to stay in that position, but he's being challenged by people who we know are involved with al Qaeda and al Qaeda-type groups and who want to subjugate other Muslims and Christians or kill Coptic Christians, as we've seen in some places, kill others, Jews, Christians, with whom they disagree. Do we really want to help either one of those?

Back before they had to teach to the test, people learned a little bit about history, and they had to learn before World War I. You don't find enough people that can talk intelligently about World War I any more.

In fact, we see the polls that say there are more people that can name the Three Stooges than can name the three branches of government because the tests they've been teaching to have the same requirements for everyone. We were doing better when they were local requirements. The local people knew best. But back when people were learning history, they found out and we were tested on and taught that World War I came about because of what we were told were entangling alliances.

What do we see around Syria? Well, Iran is propping up Assad. Russia says

we are going to send in the best anti-aircraft defense if you start a no-fly zone there. Yet this President, without the support of Congress, just like he did not have when he went into Libya—and we know how that's turned out. At least four people are dead that wouldn't be otherwise. But giving money to Syria, really? A billion dollars is what I was reading today. How about taking that billion dollars that's going to cause all kinds of death and that will probably in some way, some day end up causing the deaths of Americans and Israelis, allies of ours, Coptic children, Jewish friends, they're going to kill people that were never intended because it's not well enough thought out of this administration rushing into Syria.

Well, we didn't rush in. That's for sure. Perhaps if the President had decided early on to go in, then it wouldn't have been so massive an al Qaeda movement within the rebels. But we know they're there.

This is not the thing to do, to get involved in a country where the United States national interests will not be served if Assad stays in power, and they will not be served if the al Qaeda rebels take over. So why are we sending a billion dollars? Why are we sending help to either side in that scenario?

Let's help people at home. Let's use that money to secure our borders. Because when it comes to immigration, if we really want to care, it's time to secure the borders so legal people coming in do so legally and then we'll get an immigration bill passed in no time flat.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for June 19 and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for June 19 and today until 1 p.m.

Mr. HONDA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for June 19 and 20 on account of official business in the district.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 23. An act to designate as wilderness certain land and inland water within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes; to the committee on Natural Resources.

S. 112. An act to expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness in the State of Washington, to designate the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River and Pratt River as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the committee on Natural Resources.

S. 130. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land

to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming; to the committee on Natural Resources.

S. 157. An act too provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the committee on Natural Resources.

S. 230. An act to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the committee on Natural Resources; in addition to the committee on the Budget for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 276. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir; to the committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 304. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes; to the committee on Natural Resources.

S. 352. An act to provide for the designation of the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area in the State of Oregon, to designate segments of Wasson and Franklin Creeks in the State of Oregon as wild rivers, and for other purposes; to the committee on Natural Resources.

S. 393. An act to designate additional segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, in the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the committee on Natural Resources.

S. 459. An act to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the committee on Natural Resources.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 24, 2013, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1927. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Larry D. James, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1928. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the 2013 Major Automated Information System (MAIS) Annual Reports (MARs); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1929. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of the Department of Defense (DoD) Chemical and Biological Defense Program (CBDP) Annual Report to Congress for 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1930. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department

of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the February 20, 2013 — April 20, 2013 reporting period including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq, pursuant to Public Law 107-243, section 4(a) (116 Stat. 1501); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1931. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of Justification for Action Under Section 5(a)(8) of the Iran Sanctions Act (ISA) as Amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1932. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department of Defense Inspector General Semi-annual Report, October 1, 2012 — March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1933. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1934. A letter from the Director, Equal Employment Opportunity, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting the Endowment's annual report for FY 2012 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1935. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting 2008 ODCA Audit Report Titled "Review of the District's Cash Advance Fund"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1936. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Acquisition Regulations; Buy Indian Act; Procedures for Contracting (RIN: 1090-AB03) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1937. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Thea Foss Waterway previously known as City Waterway, Tacoma, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0911] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1938. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; USA Triathlon; Milwaukee Harbor, Milwaukee, WI [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0140] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1939. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 2013 Fish Festival Fireworks, Lake Erie, Vermilion, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0163] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1940. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety

Zone; Bay Village Independence Day Fireworks, Lake Erie, Bay Village, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0313] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1941. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Recurring Marine Events and Fireworks Displays within the Fifth Coast Guard District [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0970] (RIN: 1625-AA00, AA08) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1942. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Waldo-Hancock Bridge Demolition, Penobscot River, between Prospect and Verona, ME [Docket Number: USCG-2012-0394] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1943. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sea World San Diego Fireworks 2013 Season; Mission Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0274] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1944. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tennessee River, Mile 463.5 to 464.5; Chattanooga, TN [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0075] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1945. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Annual Firework Displays within the Captain of the Port, Puget Sound Area of Responsibility [Docket Number: USCG-2012-1001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1946. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 7(a) of the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-45), a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2013-09 suspending the limitation on the obligation of the State Department Appropriations contained in sections 3(b) and 7(b) of that Act for six months as well as the periodic report provided for under Section 6 of the Act covering the period from December 5, 2012 to the present, pursuant to Public Law 104-45, section 6 (109 Stat. 400); jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 133. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

[The following action occurred on June 6, 2013]

By Mr. GOWDY (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COBLE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 2278. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve immigration law enforcement within the interior of the United States, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Agriculture, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

[Submitted June 20, 2013]

By Mr. BACHUS:

H.R. 2446. A bill to replace the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection with a five person Commission; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 2447. A bill to direct the Committee on Technology under the National Science and Technology Council to develop a national manufacturing competitiveness strategic plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 2448. A bill to end unemployment payments to jobless millionaires; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 2449. A bill to authorize the President to extend the term of the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Civil Uses of Nuclear Energy for a period not to exceed March 19, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 2450. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to limit the number of local wage areas allowable within a General Schedule pay locality; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CHU, and Ms. CLARKE):

H.R. 2451. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish and carry out a direct lending program for small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BARBER, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 2452. A bill to amend the Small Business Act with respect to the procurement program for women-owned small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. ROTHFUS (for himself and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2453. A bill to preserve Medicare beneficiary choice by restoring and expanding the Medicare open enrollment and disenrollment opportunities repealed by section 3204(a) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. POLIS, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 2454. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for clarification as to the meaning of access without authorization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 2455. A bill to provide for the sale or transfer of certain Federal lands in Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MCHEENY, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia):

H.R. 2456. A bill to allow a State to submit a declaration of intent to the Secretary of Education to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BERA of California (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HAHN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2457. A bill to provide for a national public outreach and education campaign to raise public awareness of women's preventive health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 2458. A bill to terminate any Federal employee who refuses to answer questions or gives false testimony in a congressional hearing; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SIRE, Ms. ESTY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BARBER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. BASS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms.

JACKSON LEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CHU, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 2459. A bill to reinstate overnight delivery standards for market-dominant products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 2460. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for the establishment of the Ports as Small Business Incubators Program to provide eligible small businesses with access to commercial real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 2461. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make permanent the Small Loan Advantage program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 2462. A bill to amend subsection (a) of section 7 of the Small Business Act to eliminate guarantee fees for loans guaranteed under that subsection where the total loan amount is not more than \$150,000; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LATTA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 2463. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2464. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to remove the exclusion of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms from the definition of "consumer product" in order to permit the issuance of safety standards for such articles by the Consumer Product Safety Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2465. A bill to require the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to submit to Congress an annual report on the effects of gun violence on public health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 2466. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code to provide for strengthened protections against theft of trade secrets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2467. A bill to provide that production of all locatable minerals from mining claims located under the general mining laws, or mineral concentrates or products derived from locatable minerals from such mining claims, shall be subject to a royalty of 12.5 percent of the gross income from mining, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 2468. A bill to ensure the safety of all users of the transportation system, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, children, older individuals, and individuals with

disabilities, as they travel on and across federally funded streets and highways; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2469. A bill to direct the Mayor of the District of Columbia to establish a District of Columbia National Guard Educational Assistance Program to encourage the enlistment and retention of persons in the District of Columbia National Guard by providing financial assistance to enable members of the National Guard of the District of Columbia to attend undergraduate, vocational, or technical courses; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 2470. A bill to establish the National Commission on Effective Marginal Tax Rates for Low-Income Families; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Veterans' Affairs, Financial Services, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 2471. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to transfer regulatory authority over exports of natural gas from the Secretary of Energy to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 2472. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prohibit the preemption of State stalking laws; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 2473. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prohibit the preemption of State identity theft laws; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ENYART, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CHU, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEWIS, and Ms. CLARKE):

H.R. 2474. A bill to transfer funds to the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund to increase the availability of credit for small businesses, to improve the

microenterprise technical assistance and capacity building grant program, to establish an Office of Youth Entrepreneurship in the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ENYART, Mr. HOLT, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 2475. A bill to require the Attorney General to disclose each decision, order, or opinion of a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court that includes significant legal interpretation of section 501 or 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 unless such disclosure is not in the national security interest of the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JONES:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President is prohibited under the Constitution from initiating war against Syria without express congressional authorization and the appropriation of funds for the express purpose of waging such a war; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. PETERSON):

H. Res. 272. A resolution honoring the Drug Enforcement Administration on the occasion of its 40th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BACHUS:

H.R. 2446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3. To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate foreign and interstate commerce, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 2448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 2449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8 of the Constitution states "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States: . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power. . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States: . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power. . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 2453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 2454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 2455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 2456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 2457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:
H.R. 2458.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper . . .

By Ms. DELAURO:
H.R. 2459.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. HAHN:
H.R. 2460.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HAHN:
H.R. 2461.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HAHN:
H.R. 2462.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:
H.R. 2463.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, which states, "the Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States."

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:
H.R. 2464.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:
H.R. 2465.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. LOFGREN:
H.R. 2466.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MARKEY:
H.R. 2467.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Ms. MATSUI:
H.R. 2468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3
By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 2469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETRI:
H.R. 2470.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of section 8 of article I, which grants Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for

carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. POE of Texas:
H.R. 2471.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:
H.R. 2472.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:
H.R. 2473.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: "To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. RICHMOND:
H.R. 2474.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Constitutional authority for this bill stems from Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHIFF:
H.R. 2475.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 25: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 36: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 129: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 272: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 303: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 312: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 366: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 460: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 485: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 506: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 532: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PETERS of California, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 543: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 594: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 647: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 685: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 688: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. PASCARELL.
H.R. 708: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 721: Mr. MICA, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 724: Mr. HALL, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 755: Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BASS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. WATERS, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SABLON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 762: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 792: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 828: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 846: Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DENT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SESSIONS, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 847: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 850: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 879: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 920: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 938: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SCALISE, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 942: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 961: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 983: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1012: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 1015: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 1020: Mr. PASCARELL.
H.R. 1024: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1070: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1077: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1078: Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 1148: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1179: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1180: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico.
H.R. 1186: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1201: Mr. WELCH and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1209: Mr. BUCSHON and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1226: Mr. CAMP and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1250: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 1252: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 1254: Mr. SALMON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1288: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 1310: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 1324: Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 1339: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 1351: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1362: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1370: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1416: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1428: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RUNYAN and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1507: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1508: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PAYNE and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 1528: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1566: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1588: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1595: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 1620: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1635: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1666: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1692: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 1701: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1705: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 1717: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1725: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1726: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1731: Mr. NEAL and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1750: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 1767: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1779: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 1787: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1814: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1830: Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 1843: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1845: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1846: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 1851: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1861: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1891: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 1908: Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 1921: Ms. HANABUSA.
 H.R. 1931: Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 1953: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 1962: Mr. DUFFY.
 H.R. 2009: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. WOMACK.
 H.R. 2019: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2026: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 2027: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 2056: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 2068: Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 2089: Mr. FINCHER.
 H.R. 2203: Mr. TURNER and Mr. REED.
 H.R. 2247: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 2268: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 2273: Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 2288: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 2289: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HALL, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
 H.R. 2296: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 2300: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 2302: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.R. 2305: Mr. PAULSEN.
 H.R. 2309: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. MCCAUL.
 H.R. 2315: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 2324: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
 H.R. 2328: Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 2346: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 2350: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 2375: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FORBES, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.R. 2379: Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 2383: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 2384: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 2389: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. MCHENRY.
 H.R. 2403: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
 H.R. 2407: Mr. NADLER and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 2408: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 2409: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HARRIS,

Mr. POSEY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
 H.R. 2415: Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 2417: Mr. STOCKMAN.
 H.R. 2429: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. COLE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BARTON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. MASSIE.
 H.R. 2434: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JONES, and Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 2440: Mr. JONES.
 H.J. Res. 43: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SIREs, and Mr. WELCH.
 H. Res. 35: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. NUNES.
 H. Res. 72: Mr. WILLIAMS.
 H. Res. 229: Mr. MICHAUD.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 3, June 20, 2013, by Mr. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN on House Resolution 174, was signed by the following Members:

Chris Van Hollen, Bill Foster, Tammy Duckworth, Marc A. Veasey, Daniel T. Kildee, Henry A. Waxman, Joe Courtney, Allyson Y. Schwartz, Theodore E. Deutch, Jim Costa, Kurt Schrader, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Karen Bass, Zoe Lofgren, James P. McGovern, Gwen Moore, Michael F. Doyle, Marcia L. Fudge, Mark Takano, Melvin L. Watt, Eddie Bernice Johnson, John A. Yarmuth, Barbara Lee, Steve Israel, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, Bruce L. Braley, David N. Cicilline, Rush Holt, Mike Quigley, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Steven A. Horsford, Betty McCollum, Steve Cohen, Lois Frankel, Julia Brownley, Jim Cooper, Charles B. Rangel, Nydia M. Velázquez, Keith Ellison, Suzanne Bonamici, Eric Swalwell, Ann M. Kuster, Donna F. Edwards, Alan S. Lowenthal, Doris O. Matsui, Grace Meng, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson Jr., Hakeem S. Jeffries, William L. Enyart, Dina Titus, Susan A. Davis, Kathy Castor, Matt Cartwright, Danny K. Davis, Mark Pocan, Robert E. Andrews, André Carson, Robin L. Kelly, Ann Kirkpatrick, Cheri

Bustos, William R. Keating, Henry Cuellar, Juan Vargas, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Frederica S. Wilson, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Gene Green, Brad Sherman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Grace F. Napolitano, Elizabeth H. Esty, Steny H. Hoyer, Jared Polis, Joyce Beatty, John B. Larson, Albio Sires, Mike McIntyre, Elijah E. Cummings, Janice D. Schakowsky, Brian Higgins, Bobby L. Rush, Nick J. Rahall II, Timothy H. Bishop, Xavier Becerra, Lloyd Doggett, Wm. Lacy Clay, Yvette D. Clarke, Robert A. Brady, Derek Kilmer, Chaka Fattah, Al Green, Gregory W. Meeks, John D. Dingell, Ed Pastor, Jerrold Nadler, Suzan K. DelBene, Denny Heck, Rosa L. DeLauro, John Conyers, Jr., Emanuel Cleaver, James R. Langevin, Donald M. Payne Jr., Tony Cardenas, Tim Ryan, Michael E. Capuano, Sanford D. Bishop Jr., Peter A. DeFazio, G. K. Butterfield, Anna G. Eshoo, Judy Chu, George Miller, James P. Moran, Linda T. Sánchez, Jared Huffman, Kyrsten Sinema, Beth O'Rourke, Nancy Pelosi, Adam B. Schiff, Frank Pallone Jr., Michael H. Michaud, Nita M. Lowey, Maxine Waters, Niki Tsongas, John Lewis, Earl Blumenauer, Paul Tonko, Chellie Pingree, Gloria Negrete McLeod, David Loebsack, Peter Welch, Timothy J. Walz, Sheila Jackson Lee, Diana DeGette, David Scott, Adam Smith, Scott H. Peters, Ami Bera, Loretta Sanchez, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Ed Perlmutter, Rubén Hinojosa, Bill Pascrell Jr., Carol Shea-Porter, Joaquin Castro, Richard M. Nolan, John P. Sarbanes, James E. Clyburn, Corrine Brown, Terri A. Sewell, John C. Carney, Jr., Lois Capps, Ron Barber, Joe Garcia, William L. Owens, James A. Himes, Gerald E. Connolly, Raul Ruiz, Tulsi Gabbard, Daniel B. Maffei, Sander M. Levin, Filemon Vela, Patrick Murphy, David E. Price, Ron Kind, Ben Ray Lujan, Janice Hahn, Joseph Crowley, Alcee L. Hastings, José E. Serrano, Alan Grayson, Stephen F. Lynch, Carolyn B. Maloney, Jim McDermott, Mike Thompson, and Gary C. Peters.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following petition:

Petition 2 by Mr. COURTNEY on H.R. 1595: Judy Chu, Richard E. Neal, Barbara Lee, John Conyers Jr., Marc A. Veasey, Ron Kind, Carol Shea-Porter, Lloyd Doggett, and Jim Cooper.